

Christian Orient

March

1988

Property of
Graduate Theological Union

JUL 12 1988

EDITORIAL

THE AUTONOMOUS METROPOLITAN CHURCH
A CATHOLIC PERSPECTIVE ON ECCLESIAL COMMUNION
THE NEW VISION OF THE ROLE OF AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH
ACCORDING TO VATICAN II
PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF ECUMENISM IN THE
EASTERN CATHOLIC CHURCHES
THE LIST OF THE BISHOPS OF THE THOMAS CHRISTIANS
BOOK REVIEWS, NEWS

John Madey
Pierre Duprey

Xavier Koodapuzha

E. R. Hambye S. J.
G. Chediath

CHRISTIAN ORIENT

An Indian Journal of Eastern Churches for Creative
Theological Thinking

EDITORIAL BOARD

Section Editors

<i>Ecclesiology</i>	Dr. Xavier Koodapuzha,
<i>Spirituality</i>	Dr. Varghese Pathikulangara
<i>Liturgy</i>	Dr. Jacob Vellian
<i>Ecumenism</i>	Dr. Geevarghese Chediath
<i>News & Documentation</i>	Dr. Wilson Ukken
<i>Managing Editor</i>	Dr. Thomas Mannoorampampil

ECCLESIOLOGY

CONTENTS

Editorial	1
The Autonomous Metropolitan Church <i>John Madey</i>	3
A Catholic Perspective on Ecclesial Communion <i>Pierre Duprey</i>	11
The New Vision of the Role of Authority in the Church According to Vatican II <i>Xavier Koodapuzha</i>	22
Problems and Prospects of Ecumenism in the Eastern Catholic Churches <i>Fr. E. R. Hambye S.J.</i>	34
The list of the Bishops of the Thomas Christians <i>G. Chediath</i>	39
Book Reviews	44
News	46

March

Vol. IX

No. 1

Copyright : Christian Orient Trust, Kottayam 1986.

Manuscripts and Book Reviews are to be sent to the Managing Editor, Christian Orient Trust, P. B. 1. Vadavathoor, Kottayam - 686 010. Kerala, India.

Annual Subscription: Indian : Rs. 20/- Foreign : \$ 15/- by air mail,
\$ 10/- by sea mail

Editorial

Call to Ecclesial Authenticity

To be or not to be true to oneself is a challenge posed not only to persons and communities but even to churches. Christian Orient is committed to the cause of authenticity of the churches. The profane models and secular attitudes continue to attract individuals, communities and even particular churches. This attitude leads to an artificial existence and anonymity. Authenticity demands genuineness and identity. An alienated person or community has no content of its own except the borrowed one. Such a person or community with a borrowed identity has neither the right to claim nor is able to contribute to others something of its own. Its disappearance from history does not cause any impoverishment or loss to the society.

It is a fact that during the course of centuries, various vicissitudes of history have impoverished churches and diluted their identity and genuineness. Now Vatican II invites the Churches to return to their sources and rediscover their authentic identity. The leadership has an obligation to give an effective guidance in this process of rediscovery. But those leaders who are estranged from their own ecclesial roots are unable to give this leadership. Such an alienated leadership is not conscious of its ecclesial heritage and the intimate link with the community. It is motivated by its own personal views and interests. Instead of building up the community this kind of leadership dissipates and divides it. Such a leadership cannot be called ecclesial. If a leader is authentic he will identify himself with the community and foster its growth. The leadership which is not genuine can be compared to an empty shell devoid of its content. Its primary concern is fame, name and status. If a person of this kind is honoured, on behalf of the community, he will consider it as a recognition of his own personal talents! In short such persons isolate themselves from their own community and roots and turn out to be traitors causing divisions and dissipation in the community. Hence it is evident that authenticity demands a sound leadership which feels one with the community and its identity and aspirations. But a leadership which is not established on and supported by its ecclesial roots, will appear to be alien; it will vilify the rich heritage of the Church and try to inflate it with strange personal views at the cost of the unity and growth of the community. The result will be disastrous division and confusion among the people and loss of identity of the community and of the Church. History teaches us this lesson.

Vatican II has been very clear and categorical about the authenticity of the ecclesial identity. The spiritual, liturgical, theological, disciplinary, cultural and religious Patrimony of each individual Church is the solid basis of the identity and authenticity of the Churches. It is a fact of history that different Churches from the very early centuries emerged with their own apostolic heritage. This heritage is the backbone of their ecclesial identity.

Hence Vatican II teaches: "It is the mind of the Catholic Church that each individual Church or rite retain its traditions whole and entire while adjusting its way of life to the various needs of time and place" (OE 2.) They (Churches) are consequently of equal dignity, so that none of them is superior to the others by reason of rite. They enjoy the same rights and are under the same obligations, even with respect to preaching the gospel to the whole world under the guidance of the Roman Pontiff" (OE 3). "Attention should everywhere be given to the preservation and growth of each individual Church" (OE 4). "The Council solemnly declares that the Churches of the East, as much as those of the West, fully enjoy the right, and are in duty bound, to rule themselves" (OE 5). "All Eastern rite members should know and be convinced that they can and should always preserve their lawful liturgical rites and their established way of life, and that these should not be altered except by way of an appropriate and organic development ... If they have improperly fallen away from them because of circumstances of time or personage, let them take pains to return to their ancestral ways" (OE 6). The same principles for maintaining ecclesial identity and authenticity are given in LG 23 and UR 14-17.

Liturgical celebration has a great role to play in building up the unity and authenticity of the Churches. It is the official celebration of the faith of the Church. It is through this celebration the Churches express their faith, solidarity, unity and authenticity. They profess the same faith, celebrate the same sacraments and are in the same hierarchical communion. The common celebration of the faith builds up ecclesial identity and authenticity.

The first article in this issue on Ecclesiology is a study by John Madey (Theology Faculty, Paderborn & Paurastya Vidyapitham) on The Autonomous Metropolitan Church according to the new Oriental Code. It is followed by a study by Pierre Duprey (Secretariate for Promoting Christian Unity, Vatican) on The Catholic Perspective on Ecclesial Communion. The new vision of the nature and function of authority in the Church is the subject of the third article contributed by the editor himself. The fourth article is on The Problems and Prospects of Ecumenism by E. R. Hambye (Pont. Oriental Institute, Rome). The list of bishops of the Thomas Christians is prepared by G. Chediath. I am very thankful to all the contributors and co-workers for their scholarly contributions and co-operation.

Pont. Oriental Institute of Religious Studies
Vadavathoor P. O., Kottayam, India.

Xavier Koodapuzha

The Autonomous Metropolitan Church

According to the 1986 draft of the Code of Eastern Canon Law

It is a generally admitted fact that, in the ecclesiastical structure, the patriarchate is the summit of the hierarchy. We find, nowadays, however, different kinds of autonomous churches or, as the forthcoming Code of Eastern Canon Law will have it, *Ecclesiae sui iuris*, whose protohierarchs do not have the patriarchal title and dignity.

I. Non-Catholic churches

In this regard, there is a different conception in (a) the Eastern Orthodox Churches and (b) the Oriental Orthodox Churches.

1. The *Eastern Orthodox Churches*¹ are making a distinction between the (a) autocephalous and the (b) autonomous churches. This distinction does not seem applicable in regard to the eastern and/ or oriental churches which are enjoying full communion with the Church of Rome.

(a) The *autocephalous* churches, united by the same dogma and the same hierarchical leadership are in full ecclesiastical communion among each other, but they are administered by their respective holy synod headed by the respective protohierarch. He may be a patriarch, an archbishop or a metropolitan. In the practical life of the churches, these different

titles have no major relevance. All the autocephalous churches rule themselves independently as well in regard to their internal life as in respect to the other churches applying the canons of the first seven ecumenical councils and the statutes established by their own holy synods. The see of Constantinople – New Rome enjoys a primacy of honour.²

Originally, there have been, in the East, the four patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. Later some of the daughter – churches of Constantinople adopted the patriarchal title for their protohierarchs, too. So there are now, besides the ancient patriarchates, the younger patriarchates of Moscow and All Russia, of Serbia (Yugoslavia), Rumania and Bulgaria. The Georgian church, established outside the ancient Roman empire, attributes the title of catholicos – patriarch to its protohierarch. The churches of Cyprus and Greece are headed by archbishops while the other autocephalous churches call their first dignitaries metropolitans. All the hierarchical heads are elected and enthroned by their respective holy synods, and none from among them needs confirmation from any higher authority. The other churches are simply informed of the canonical election by letters of communion.

1. We are following here the nomenclature established by the World Council of Churches.
2. On the implications of this 'precedence of honour', see Maximos Metropolitan of Sardes, *The Oecumenical Patriarchate in the Orthodox Church*, Thessaloniki 1976, 267–327.

(b) The *autonomous* churches, in spite of enjoying a large autonomy within their own territory, as e.g. the church of Finland, are bound to their respective mother church depending on it in all major affairs. So the election of the protohierarch whatever title he or the other bishops may have, have to get the confirmation by the holy synod. Although the bishops' assembly of the autonomous churches is often called a synod, too, its rights are not so extended as those of the autocephalous churches.

2. In the *Oriental Orthodox Churches* which dogmatically accept only the first three ecumenical councils, the institutions of autocephaly and autonomy are not particularly defined. Yet, we can regard as 'autocephalous' the Coptic Orthodox Church headed by the Pope of Alexandria, the Syrian Orthodox Church headed by the Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, the Supreme Catholicate of All the Armenians (Edshmiadzin), the Armenian Catholicate of Cilicia (Antelias) and the patriarchate of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. The Orthodox Syrian Church of Malankara, having broken off communion with the Syrian Orthodox Church, is facing rather a delicate situation for being not recognised as an autocephalous body by all the other oriental orthodox churches. An 'autonomous' status could be attributed to the Malankara Jacobite Syrian Orthodox Church headed by the Catholicos of the East who is holding the office of the ancient Mafryōnō within the Syrian Orthodox Church. The synod of the catholicate, remains, in certain affairs, dependent on the decisions of the universal synod of the patriarchate. Since the patriarch is elected by the universal synod presided over by the catholicos, it goes without saying that the election of the catholicos and his hierarchy must be endorsed by the confirmation of the same synod.

II. Catholic churches

Since the whole Catholic Church is entrusted to "pastoral guidance of the Roman Pontiff, who by God's appointment is successor to Blessed Peter in primacy over the Universal Church" (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 3), we cannot compare any of the autonomous churches with the orthodox autocephalous churches. This is why the unofficial English translation of the 1986 draft of the Code of the Eastern Canon Law, edited by the United States Eastern Catholic Bishops Consultation, uses the term "Autonomous Churches" for all the churches *sui iuris* whatever rank they may have.

"The term 'autonomous churches' is used in this Code for groups of the Christian faithful bound together by a hierarchy according to the norm of law, and which are expressly or tacitly acknowledged as autonomous by the supreme authority of the Church" (c. 27 § 1).

Among these autonomous churches, we have to distinguish two groups, namely

a) the patriarchal churches and the major archiepiscopal churches, with both have a *synod of bishops*, and

b) the autonomous metropolitan churches which have a *council of hierarchs*, and the other autonomous churches forming but one eparchy.

In our deliberations, we are concentrating *alone* on the autonomous metropolitan churches. In contrast to a major archiepiscopal church which can comprise more than one ecclesiastical province, the autonomous metropolitan church is made up of one ecclesiastical unit headed by a metropolitan. The status of a metropolitan church *sui iuris* is certainly

to be attributed to the Ethiopian Catholic Church and the Syro-Malankara Church, perhaps also to the Byzantine Ruthenian Church in the United States of America.³

Since the patriarchate is the summit of the ecclesiastical hierarchical set-up and these churches do neither have a patriarch nor a major archbishop enjoying quasi-patriarchal powers, it is the bishop of Rome who, in virtue of his primacy over the universal church, exercises, on the principle of subsidiarity, patriarchal powers over these churches.

The contrast in regard to the churches having a synod is manifest already in the first sentence of the draft dealing with the autonomous metropolitan churches. As they do not have a synod, but only a council of hierarchs, neither the metropolitan nor the other bishops can be freely elected and enthroned, but are appointed by the Roman Pontiff (c. 155 § 1; c. 166; cf. c. 179 § 2).

For the *appointment of the metropolitan and the bishops*, the council is to compose a list of at least three of the more suitable candidates and send it to the Roman Apostolic See. The opinion of certain priests or other Christian faithful "outstanding in wisdom concerning the needs of the church and the special talents of a person required for the episcopate" can be sought (c. 166). But the appo-

intment itself remains alone *in the competence of the Roman Pontiff*. The supreme authority in the church is also alone entitled to establish, modify, suppress and determine the definite boundaries of autonomous metropolitan churches (c. 155 § 2).

There is no provision for bishops constituted outside the boundaries of the autonomous metropolitan church, as it is the case in the patriarchal and major archiepiscopal churches (cf. cc. 149 and 150; although these canons are among those for the patriarchal churches, they can be equally applied in the major archiepiscopal churches).

Relation to the Roman Pontiff: The autonomous metropolitan has to ask the *pallium* from the Roman Pontiff within three months after his ordination or, if he is an ordained bishop, after his enthronement. The *pallium* is a sign of his metropolitan power and also of his full communion with the Roman Pontiff (c. 156 § 1).

Neither the canons on patriarchs nor on major archbishops mention the *pallium*, but speak of granting ecclesial communion or confirmation on the part of the Roman Pontiff (c. 75 § 2; 153 §§ 2 and 3).

Only after having obtained the *pallium*, the autonomous metropolitan can convoke the council of hierarchs or ordain bishops (c. 156 § 2).

3. Since the Syro-or Chaldeo-Malabar Church is practically an "acephalous" body having no hierarchical head, we do not see under which category of autonomous churches it could be placed. With two equal metropolitan provinces and a number of separated eparchies belonging to Roman Catholic provinces, this church cannot even be considered as an autonomous metropolitan church. But it is also not a part of the Roman Catholic Church and does not come under the law endorsed in the Roman Catholic Codex Iuris Canonici (cf. CIC c. 1). It is somehow strange to see that even bishops refer to this code of canon law, as e. g. Mar Kuriakose Kunna-cherry, *Deaconess in the Church: A Pastoral Need of the Day?* (= The Syrian Churches Series, X), Kottayam 1987, 3.

In token of his full communion with the Roman Pontiff, the metropolitan has the obligation of commemorating him in the liturgical services and see that this is also done by all the bishops and the other clerics of the metropolitan church according to the prescriptions in the liturgical books (c. 163).

The metropolitan's rights: The power of the metropolitan over bishops and other faithful is exercised according to the norms of law and other legitimate customs. It is ordinary and proper, but at the same time personal. This means that he has to exercise his power in person. He is not allowed to appoint a vicar for the whole metropolitan church nor to delegate it for all the cases (c. 157 § 1). There cannot be a kind of "vice-metropolitan", as there can be a vice-president in a Roman Catholic bishop's conference.

It must be noted that the power of the metropolitan as well as of the council of hierarchs is strictly limited to the territory of the autonomous metropolitan church (c. 157 § 2).

Since the head of the metropolitan church is the bishop of a determined see (c. 151), he will reside in the principal city of his metropolitanate (c. 158 § 1) of which he also will take the title (e. g. of Addis Ababa; of Trivandrum, etc.).

In his own eparchy, the metropolitan has the same rights and obligations as any eparchial bishop (c. 158 § 2; cf. cc. 188-209). We are not dealing with these rights and obligations which are beyond the scope of this study.

Canon 159 enumerates beyond those things which are given to the metropolitan by common law or by particular law, some of his particular rights:

1. to ordain and enthrone bishops of his church within the term determined by law;

2. to convoke the council of hierarchs, to preside over, transfer or dissolve it;

3. to establish a metropolitan tribunal;

4. to oversee that the faith and ecclesiastical discipline are accurately maintained;

5. to conduct canonical visitations in the eparchies, if the eparchial bishop neglected to do it;

6. to assign an administrator of an eparchy in the case, mentioned in c. 219 no. 4, i. e. if the administrator of a vacant eparchy is not elected within eight days or if the elected one lacks the conditions for the validity of the election. The administrator of a vacant eparchy has to be a bishop or a celibate priest who has completed thirty-five years of age and who has not already been elected, proposed, appointed or transferred to the same vacant see (c. 225 § 2);

7. to appoint or confirm him who was legitimately proposed or elected to office, if the eparchial bishop, not detained by a just impediment, within the time established by law omitted to do so and to appoint a steward if the eparchial bishop neglected to appoint him (the term 'steward' is used for 'econome, procurator');

8. to communicate the acts of the Roman Pontiff to the eparchial bishops and others to whom they pertain unless the Roman Apostolic See directly provides for it, and see to the faithful execution of the prescriptions contained in these acts.

What is said in points 1 to 5 and in point 7, is identical to what c. 133 says in regard to the metropolitans

of a patriarchal church. Hence only nos. 6 and 8 express something particular regarding the supra-eparchial rights of an autonomous metropolitan.

The metropolitan's relation to the other bishops: Since neither the metropolitan nor the eparchial bishops depending on him are monarchic leaders of the faithful confided to their care, the bishops will, in extraordinary matters or those entailing special difficulties, ask the opinion of the metropolitan, and so also the metropolitan will hear the opinions of his comprovincial bishops before taking a decision (c. 160). This canon is based on the ancient canons of the early church.

The unity of the autonomous metropolitan church finds its expression also in the liturgical services during which the bishops and all the other clerics are bound to *commemorate the metropolitan* after the Roman Pontiff according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books (c. 162). The omission of the metropolitan's commemoration is a grave offence against the unity of the metropolitan church in particular and the universal church in general.

The council of hierarchs: As already pointed out above, the autonomous metropolitan church lags, in its structure, behind the patriarchal and the major archiepiscopal church. This is the reason why it does not have a synod of bishops which includes all the ordained bishops (c. 102), but only a council of hierarchs in which alone the eparchial bishops of the metropolitan church have got a deliberative voice; the other bishops of the same church and even bishops of another autonomous church can be invited as guests, if the majority of the ordinary members of the synod agree.

We cannot grasp why this canon is making (a) such a restriction in regard to the "other bishops" who

are coadjutor and auxiliary bishops of the autonomous metropolitan church and does not keep this issue open for regulations according to the particular law, (b) allowing at the same time, under certain conditions, the participation of bishops belonging to other autonomous churches. In this regard, this canon is narrower than c. 450 § 1 of the Roman Catholic (Latin) Code of Canon Law giving membership in the bishops' conferences to all the diocesan bishops and all those made equal to them (*aequiparati*), coadjutor bishops, auxiliary bishops and other titular bishops who have an office in the given territory by mandate of the Apostolic See or the bishops' conference itself.

There is no such restriction in the patriarchal and the major archiepiscopal churches (cf. c. 102 §§ 2 and 3).

The members of the council of hierarchs are obliged to attend the sessions (c. 163 § 2; cf. c. 104 § 1).

"If a certain eparchial bishop considers himself to be detained by a legitimate impediment, he is to submit his reasons in writing to the council; the eparchial bishops who are present in the designated location at the opening session of the council are to decide on the legitimacy of the impediment" (c. 163 § 3; cf. c. 104 § 2).

No member of the council of bishops can send a proxy nor can anyone have a double vote (c. 163 § 3; cf. 105).

Once the council is opened, none of the bishops can leave the assembly unless for a just reason approved by the president of the council (c. 163 § 5; cf. c. 109 which, however, says "approved by the synod"!)

The council of hierarchs has a *legislative power*, it is entitled to make laws and establish norms for the whole

of the autonomous metropolitan church which are not expressly defined by common law. It can also legislate in those cases which by common law are remitted to the particular law (c. 165 § 1). The acts and decisions of the council do not possess immediate effect. In contrast to the Synod of bishops in a patriarchal or major archiepiscopal church which designates itself the manner and time of promulgation of laws and the publication of decisions (c. 111 § 1), all the decisions regarding the enactment of norms and laws in the autonomous metropolitan church have to be communicated by the metropolitan as the head of the council to the Roman Apostolic See. He cannot promulgate them before having obtained written notification of the reception of the acts of the council from the supreme authority. He has to notify the Apostolic See also of other actions of the council of hierarchs (c. 165 § 2).

The autonomous metropolitan has the right to perform all the administrative acts which by common law are committed to the superior authority of an autonomous church, however with the consent of the council of hierarchs (c. 165 § 3).

It is within the corresponsibility of the council of hierarchs to see "that the pastoral needs of the Christian are fulfilled, and concerning these needs, [the council] can establish whatever is appropriate in order to provide for an increase in the faith, the fostering of common pastoral activity, the supervision of morals, the *observation of their own rite* as well as common ecclesiastical discipline" (c. 167 § 1). These decisions receive binding force, however, only *after approval by the Apostolic See*, with due regard for c. 165 § 2 (c. 167 § 2).

The council of hierarchs is to be

held *at least once a year* and whenever special circumstances warrant it or "matters are to be executed which are reserved by common law to the council or for which execution the consent of the same council is required" (c. 168).

The council of hierarchs *must* draw up its *statutes* and transmit them to the Roman Apostolic See. The statutes have to provide a secretary for the council, preparatory commissions, the order of procedure as well as other means which the member consider effective for the attainment of its goals (c. 169).

As the patriarchal and major archiepiscopal churches must have a *patriarchal convocation*, the autonomous metropolitan church must have its *assembly at least once every five years*. What is said, in this respect, of the patriarch applies here to the metropolitan. This is why we quote entirely the respective canons:

Canon 140. The patriarchal assembly is a consultative college of the entire church over which the patriarch presides, which assists the patriarch and the synod of bishops* in dealing with matters of major importance especially in order to harmonize appropriately the form and rationale of the apostolate and ecclesiastical discipline, taking into account the circumstances of the time and the common good of its own church as well as the common good of the entire territory where several autonomous churches co-exist.

Canon 141. The patriarchal convocation is to be convoked at least every five years and whenever the patriarch with the consent of the permanent synod or the synod of bishops considers it useful.

* Read in this context always: metropolitan and the council of hierarchs.

Canon 142. § 1. The patriarch is to convoke the patriarchal convocation, to preside and also to close it; the patriarch is to designate a vice-president who presides over the convocation in the absence of the patriarch.

§ 2. If the patriarchal see becomes vacant, the patriarchal convocation is suspended by the law itself until the new patriarch decides on the matter.

Canon 143. § 1. To the patriarchal convocation are to be summoned:

1. eparchial bishops and other local hierarchs;

2. titular bishops;

3. presidents of monastic confederations, superiors general of institutes of consecrated life and also superiors of autonomous monasteries;

4. rectors of catholic universities and of ecclesiastical universities as well as deans of faculties of theology or canon law, which have their seats within the territory of the church in which the convention is held;

5. rectors of major seminaries;

6. from each eparchy at least one priest enrolled in the same eparchy, preferably a pastor, one religious or member of societies of common life according to the manner of the religious as well as two laypersons, unless the statutes determine a greater number, who all are designed in a manner determined by the eparchial bishop and indeed, if it is a case of a member of an institute of consecrated life, with the consent of the competent superior.

§ 2. All who are to be convoked to the patriarchal assembly must attend it unless they are detained

by a just impediment, of which they are obliged to inform the patriarch; however, eparchial bishops can send a proxy.

§ 3. Persons of another autonomous church can be invited to the patriarchal assembly and can take part in it according to the norm of the statutes.

§ 4. To the patriarchal assembly can also be invited certain observers from other churches or non-catholic ecclesial communities.

Canon 144. § 1. Without prejudice for the right of any Christian faithful to put questions to his hierarch, only the patriarch or the synod of bishops are to determine the matters to be discussed in the patriarchal assembly.

§ 2. Through prior appropriate commissions and consultations, the patriarch is to see that all of the questions are adequately drawn up and transmitted to the members of the assembly at an opportune time.

Canon 145. The patriarchal assembly is to have its statutes approved by the synod of bishops, in which are contained the norms for attaining the necessary goals of the assembly.

In the case of *vacancy of the metropolitan see*, the role of administrator of the autonomous metropolitan church falls by law to the eparchial bishop who is the senior according to the episcopal ordination (c. 170 § 1). It is his duty to inform the Roman Pontiff of the vacancy of the see. The powers of the metropolitan in all matters excluding those which are bound to the consent of the council of hierarchs, pass to him. As the power of the administrator is an ordinary one, in a vacant metropolitan see nothing is to be innovated (c. 171 § 1).

In an impeded metropolitan see, the same prescriptions are to be applied which are established in c. 132 § 1 in respect to an impeded patriarchal see.

Regarding the vacant or impeded see of the eparchy of the metropolitan, cc. 219–231 are to be observed.

CONCLUSION

Autonomous Metropolitan Churches or Archiepiscopal Churches?

Already at the Second Council of Vatican, during the discussions on the draft of the decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, no. 11, the question of elevating the Ethiopian and other churches to the rank of patriarchate was raised.⁴ This issue was not at all without foundation. As regards the Ethiopian Catholic Church and the Syro-Malankara Church, their non-catholic counterparts – the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and the Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church – are enjoying autocephaly having a full-fledged synodal structure with a patriarch or catholicos as their presiding prelate. Should the catholic oriental churches of the same historical and ritual background be considered of lesser value and should therefore their autonomy be more restricted than necessary? So far only the Ukrainian Catholic Church has been recognised a quasi-patriarchal status in the form of a major archiepiscopate.

After having analysed the canons regarding the autonomous metropolitan churches we have become aware of the existing difference between a major archiepiscopal church and an autonomous metropolitan church. We believe the difference to be not only a gradual, but an essential one.

A *major archbishop* is a metropolitan of a see determined or acknowledged by the supreme authority of the Church, who presides over an entire eastern autonomous church but is not endowed with the patriarchal title (c. 151). The entire church can comprise one or several metropolitan churches. It would be, however, too much to say that the archiepiscopal church must have several ecclesiastical provinces. What is of relevance is the fact that the major archbishop presides over an entire church, hence also, according to the norm of law, over those parts of the church living in the emigration, outside the original boundaries of the autonomous church.

This is why “what is stated in common law concerning patriarchal churches or patriarchs is understood to be applicable to major archiepiscopal churches and major archbishops, unless the law provides otherwise or it is evident from the nature of the matter” (c. 152).

As for the election of the major archbishop, the election itself follows the same pattern as that of patriarchs (cc. 62–73) which implies that the major archbishop is elected by the synod of bishops (c. 153 § 1). After the acceptance of the election by the newly elected, the synod of bishops must notify the Roman Pontiff through a synodal letter that the election was canonically conducted, and the elected has to petition, in a letter signed by himself, the *confirmation* of his election *from the Roman Pontiff* (c. 153 § 2). In contrast to the autonomous metropolitan, the major archbishop is not appointed by the Roman Pontiff.

Having obtained the confirmation, the elected must take a profession of

4. See the commentary of Abbot Dr. Johannes M. Hoeck OSB, *Decretum de Ecclesiis Orientalibus Catholicis/Dekret über die katholischen Ostkirchen*: Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche – Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil I 376; see also M. M. Wojnar, *Decree on the Oriental Catholic Churches*: The Jurist 25 (1965) 205f.

A Catholic Perspective on Ecclesial Communion *

The final salutation of Second Corinthians (XIII, 14) has been used in most liturgies.

This fact alone shows that we are here at the heart of the christian mystery. The communion of the Holy Spirit, manifestation of the Father's love in the grace of the Lord Jesus is the gift towards which the whole economy of salvation tends. The communion of the Holy Spirit is the gift of God, hence an eminently objective reality, freely received by us and independent of us in its fundamental existence. But as with all the gifts God makes to them, men have the awe-inspiring possibility of refusing it, as they have the obligation, having once received the gift, to live it, to make actual all its dimensions and potentialities, in submission and docility to Him who both gives and is given.

It is on this level first of all that ecclesial communion must be affirmed, because everything in the Church more or less immediately derives from this and is ordered towards it. For Irenaeus the history of salvation is a progressive introduction of man into communion with God¹. Beyond all legislation, all past ruptures and present divisions, one fact stands out which can be expressed by paraphrasing words of St Augustine: whether we like it or not, we are brothers. We are brothers not in the fashion of this passing world, not by blood, but according to the world to come, that last eternal world into which all will enter who have received the Word made flesh, who believe in His name and so are born of God, become children of God and thus brothers and sisters of one another. It is with our brotherhood as with our sonship. Our brotherhood in its profound reality (cf. I John III,

faith and a promise to carry out faithfully his office. Thereupon he is proclaimed major archbishop and enthroned, if he is an ordained bishop. If he is not yet an ordained bishop, the enthronement can take place only after his episcopal ordination (c. 153 § 3). If, however, the confirmation is denied, a new election must be conducted within the time stated by the Roman Pontiff (c. 153 § 4).

"Major archbishops hold the precedence of honour immediately after the patriarchs according to the order of the establishment as a major archi-

episcopal church of the Church over which they preside" (c. 154). Taking this into account, the *Annuario Pontificio 1987* has placed, for the first time, the Ukrainian major archbishop immediately after the patriarchs and not, as in previous years, among the archdiocesan and diocesan sees.

The issue to which category do belong the Ethiopian and the Syro-Malankara Churches needs an explanation from the Roman Pontiff as the supreme legislator of the universal church.

John Madey

* Paper presented at the International Theological Conference of the Catholic Oriental Churches (3-10 July 1986) held at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Vadavathoor, Kottayam.

1. Adv. Haer. IV, 14, 2; SC 100 pp. 543-545.

1-2) cannot be broken except by such culpable infidelity as will strike at our filial relationship and cut us off from the communion of the Holy Spirit.

What are the various aspects and different levels of realisation of this communion of the Holy Spirit which is ecclesial communion? That is what we must outline together today. From the beginning I have wished to stress the unique character of this communion, and of the community which results from it, to avoid at once whatever might tempt us to apply to the Church a profane model, which was and still is the source of so many errors in this area².

First, what does the word mean? *koinonia* comes from *koinos*: common,³ the opposite of *idios*: proper, particular, private⁴. *koinoô*, to put together, to pool. *koinonia* then will be the action of having in common, sharing in, participating in⁵. The corresponding

Latin term will be *communio* or *communicatio*⁶. The basic idea seems to be, in Plato, that of having in common, participating in. In Aristotle, two aspects are distinguished: community of interest and community of mind or spirit. For him the concept implies: a plurality of participants, a common purpose envisaged, an action in common and the difference between the participants.⁷ Father Congar notes that in the real sense of *koinonia*, communion is very close to *metochi*, participation⁸. For Father Tillard it is "a solidarity founded on the participation of all in one good which is the Spirit of the Risen Lord binding them to the one Body of Christ. It is a matter of the relation of all to the same good which each possesses and which binds them together⁹. But here we have already moved from the general meaning of the word: "a relation existing between persons participating in the same good", to its properly Christian content.

2. Joseph Ratzinger, *Le nouveau peuple de Dieu* (Paris, 1971, p. 88).
3. It is interesting to note that Homer knows nothing of *koinos*, but uses its equivalent *xynos* and its derivatives *xynoô*: to share, *xynônia*: community, covenant. We observe the links with words made up with the prefix *xyn* = *syn*, notably *synodos*, *synedrion* (cf. Ignatius, *Magn.* 6, 1; *Trall.* 3, 1; *Philad.* 8, 1); *synodia*. See Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III, 4, 3 (SC 211, pp. 50-51 and 210, pp. 244-5: *afistamenos tis tôn adelphôn synodias*: separated from the communion of the brethren (the SC translation has "community"). The passage is about Cerdo convicted of heresy and excommunicated. There might be here an interesting starting point for studying the links between communion, conciliarity and collegiality.
4. In the economy of the new covenant because of its personal interiorisation opposition between "common" and "particular" was to become outdated. This will be seen later.
5. *Met-ekhô*: to have with.
6. Cf. L. M. Dewailly, *Communio-communicatio*, brèves notes sur l'histoire d'un sémantème, in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, t. 54 (1970), pp. 43-63.
7. H. J. Sieben, in *Koinônia, communauté-communion*, in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (Paris, 1975), col. 1743-1745. The elements of the description of the concept by Aristotle might offer a useful framework for a theological development.
8. *Le Concile de Vatican II, son Eglise, peuple de Dieu et corps du Christ*, *Théologie historique* 71 (Paris 1984) p. 34: see also *Sainte Eglise, études et approches ecclésiologiques* (Paris 1963) pp. 37-40.
9. In *Koinônia, communauté-communion*, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, col. 1759.

I cannot here make a study of *koinonia* in Scripture and the primitive Church¹⁰. It want merely to point to the preparation in the Old Testament for the theme of communion in the themes of inheritance and covenant¹¹. Israel is the inheritance of Yahwe (e.g. *Exod* XXXIV,9), it is his particular possession. There is a relationship of unique intimacy between God and the people he has chosen and with whom he has made a covenant: "they shall be my people and I will be their God" (e.g. *Jer*. XXIV, 7). From the time of the first covenant (cf. *Gen*. XV) God promised to give as inheritance to this people a land where they could live. The idea of inheritance like that of covenant is progressively deepened and spiritualised. For the Levites, a tribe with no territory of their own, the inheritance is Yahwe (*Deut*. X, 9) but this becomes a characteristic of the whole people: "Yahwe is their portion" (cf. *Jer*. X, 16; *Ps*. XVI, 5). To possess land becomes the conventional expression for perfect happiness (*Ps*. XXXVII, 11). In the second beatitude (*Mtt*. V, 4) the land is the equivalent of the Kingdom. In the New Testament –

the new covenant – it is the Kingdom (*Mtt*. XXV, 34)¹², the eternal life (*Mtt*. XIX, 29), the very fullness of God's gifts, which become the inheritance. The members of the new people of God are heirs of God and fellow-heirs with Christ (*Rom*. VIII, 17). The inheritance is participation in the life of the risen Lord (cf. *I Cor*. XV, 49–50). From now on we live by the promised Spirit which has been given to us and we hope for full possession (cf. *Eph*. I, 14).

We come back here to "the communion of the Holy Spirit" as the end of the whole economy of salvation. Although the Greeks only used *koinonia* with the genitive of the thing shared in, in St Paul the term is used with a genitive of the person: he thus demonstrates that the basis of the Christian community, namely salvation, is not a sharing in something but an intimate *relationship with a divine person*.¹³

Koinonia designates the relationship of the believer with the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit and at the same time the new relation, established as a consequence, between

10. See John M. McDermott, *The biblical doctrine of Koinōnia*, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, t. 19 (1975), pp. 64–77 and 219–233. J. Coppens, *La Koinōnia dans l'Eglise primitive*, *Eph. Theol. Gov.* 46 (1970), pp. 116–121; Pier Cesare Bori, *Koinōnia* (Brescia, 1972).

11. Cf. *Héritage et Alliance*, in *vocabulaire de Théologie biblique* (Paris, 1970).

12. We cannot but recall here that for Saint Maximus the Confessor the kingdom of God is the Holy Spirit (*Exp. Orat. Dom.* PG 90, 884).

13. J. M. McDermott, *DS art. cit.*, col. 1745. See Y. Congar, *Pneumatologie dogmatique*, in *Initiation à la pratique de la théologie*, t. 11 (Paris, 1982) pp. 497–500.

It has recently been shown that the covenant was a choice bringing about a living in common whose future was guaranteed by the promise; the promise which was also a pledge of the indefectible fidelity of the divine partner. The term 'communion' makes clear what is at issue in the covenant. The prophetic preaching calls Israel to "a movement of withdrawal with regard to the granting of the goods" promised in order to direct it towards a searching for God, who ultimately promises himself. That means that the being together, the communion is an end on its own and in itself.

believers. This relation between believers is just as real, mysterious and spiritual as that established with God—when I say spiritual here I use the term in the strong sense: that which belongs to the Spirit, which appertains to a definitive, eschatological reality.¹⁴ It is the communion of saints, that is the communion existing between all those who are made saints by the gift of the Spirit uniting them to Christ on his way to the Father. This communion is on the increase throughout the course of history, of which it is the ultimate reason and the final goal.¹⁵ At the end, as St Augustine says, there will be only one Christ, one only Son loving the Father for all eternity.¹⁶

During the time that separates the resurrection of Christ from the parousia, this communion, of its nature invisible, must yet manifest itself in and through a community. At the same time the community is the setting through which and in which that communion can be established and expanded.¹⁷ In successive christian generations this will be also the community of Christ's faithful which, by its unity resulting from its communion with the Father through the Son in the Spirit,¹⁸ will witness before the

world that the Father has really sent this Son¹⁹; that in the Son he has reconciled the world to himself and has entrusted to the Church the ministry of reconciliation²⁰.

What will be the elements of communion at this visible level where the unity of the community has its structure? They are found listed in some fashion in the summary account of the Acts where St Luke traces the portrait of the ideal community: *fidelity to the teaching* of the apostles; *fraternal charity by which* the believers are of one heart and one mind and hold everything in common; *participation in the eucharist* and in the life of prayer.²¹ Paul underlines the importance of baptism²² and the eucharist²³ for being integrated into and living in the community. He returns several times to the fact that community solidarity implies the service of the poorest brethren.²⁴

Traditionally, and presupposing the gift of the Holy Spirit, these elements are: the bond of the *one profession of faith, sacramental life, acceptance of the Church's hierarchy* and its direction of the Church. These three components correspond to the power to *preach, sanctify* and *govern* which Christ has entrusted to his Church²⁵.

14. Cf. Epistle to the Hebrews.

15. Cf. Apoc. 6, 9–11; Ephes. 1, 9–10; I Cor. 14–24.

16. Cf. *In Epist. Joan. ad Parthos* X, 3; PL 35, 2055–2056.

17. Cf. I Jo. I, 1–3.

18. Cf. Saint Cyprien (*De Oral. Dom.* 23, PL 4, 4.553).

“The Church is the people that draws its unity from the unity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit”, cited in *Lumen Gentium*, 4.

19. Cf. Jo. 17, 21.

20. Cf. II Cor. 5, 18–20.

21. Cf. Acts 2, 42–46 and 4, 32.

22. Cf. Gal. 3, 26–27; Rom. 6, 3–11; Col. 3, 3 etc.

23. Cf. I Cor. 10; 16–17.

24. Cf. Rom. 15, 26–27; II Cor. 8, 2–4; 9, 12–14.

25. Cf. *Lumen Gentium*, 14 and the commentary by Mgr Philips in *L'Eglise et son ministère au deuxième Concile du Vatican*, histoire, texte et commentaire on the Constitution *Lumen Gentium* (Paris, 1967), t. 1, p. 196. Henceforward the work will be cited “Philips”. The perspectives and dimensions of this study do not allow us to show sufficiently how the

Thus the Christian community is gathered for a life of holiness by and about those who continue to exercise within it the pastoral charge which the apostles first received from the Lord. This communion in or sharing of holy things which seems to have been the primitive meaning of the expression "*communio sanctorum*" is ecclesial communion at the visible level: it is the criterion and the condition of the unity of the community²⁶ and of unity between communities.²⁷

Ecclesial communion will be full and perfect between Churches if these constituent elements of the unity of the Church are lived in each Church.²⁸

It will be incomplete, imperfect insofar as they are lacking.²⁹ In this case it will be *imperfect but real*—of the same reality as the gifts of God which are its basis. Moreover in either case we are talking about realities used by the Spirit to give structure to a community and make it attain its end. By their profound natural dynamism as gifts of God to his Church they tend towards full realisation. The unity which they manifest and maintain in such a Church, and between it and others tends towards full unity. This is what *Lumen Gentium* calls "catholic unity" without giving to the adjective a confessional meaning which has often been put upon it.³⁰ It was left to the

reception of the word of God in faith is the basis of the unity of the community. "Fidelity to the teaching of the Apostles" is the first characteristic mentioned by Luke. We know the importance for Paul of faith which responds to the preaching of the word of God (cf. for instance Rom. 10, 14-17) and the necessity of fidelity to the authentic Gospel (cf. Gal. 1, 8-9). For 1st Jn. it is by receiving the apostolic witness that we enter into the apostolic community and into its communion with the Father and the Son. An ecclesiology of communion would have to give to this point its full weight.

26. Cf. *Christus Dominus*, n. 11; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 41.

27. *Tomos Agapis*, n. 176.

28. I refer here to the presence and putting into practice of all these elements in each Church. I do not wish to say that all these are fully and perfectly lived up to in all these Churches. In this sense communion within one Church and between the Churches needs still to grow and be perfected. It seems that the expression "full and perfect" comes from Paul VI. To the references given by Philips we should add the great speech at Grottaferrata on August 18th, 1963 where Paul VI spoke of the Orthodox Churches (*Documentation Catholique*, 15 September 1963). This expression assumes the possibility of incomplete and imperfect communion (cf. Philips t. 1, p. 196).

29. This whole question is further developed in Cardinal Jan Willebrands, *L'Avenir de l'oecuménisme*, in *Proche Orient Chrétien*, t. 25 (Jerusalem, 1975), pp. 3-15. Prof. Oscar Cullmann said that it is possible to go beyond christian fullness. From the protestant point of view it is this something more, something to much in Catholicism which is an obstacle to communion (cf. Thils, op. cit. pp. 58-59).

30. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 8 and n. 15 and Philips' commentary, t. 1, p. 119 and pp. 200-206; t. 2, pp. 297-298. Note that in n. 15 in a general description the episcopate is pointed to as an element common to other Churches and ecclesial communities. "Apostolic succession" was deliberately avoided, so as to include the Churches or ecclesial communities which preserve this structure of the Church, but with whom 'apostolic succession' is a 'subject of dispute' (Philips, t. 1, p. 204).

Decree on Ecumenism to be more precise:

"...some, even very many of the elements or endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church herself can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church...All of these, which come from Christ and lead back to Him, belong by right to the one Church of Christ."³¹

Of this one Church of Christ it is said in *Lumen Gentium* that it subsists in the Catholic Church. Hence it is not identified with the latter in an exclusive way. This also emerges clearly from the description which the Decree gives of the relations of the Catholic Church with the oriental Churches, notably when it says of the latter that "...through the celebration of the Eucharist of the Lord in each of these Churches, the Church of God is built up and grows in stature."³²

We have here evidently an *ontological* not a canonical or juridical notion of communion.³³ The confusing of these two notions has created and still often creates difficulty. I shall return to this later on, but I should like to say at once about the passage just quoted that the "visible boundaries of the Catholic Church" are determined by canonical or juridical communion, while beyond these boundaries there exist Churches with which it is in ontological communion which is more or less complete. Before going on, I should like to emphasise here the effort made by the Catholic Church in the Council to provide a secure theological basis for real ecumenical commitment. It was a question of respecting fully the faith in the oneness of the Church of Christ and the Catholic Church's awareness of being that Church. On the other end it was necessary to recognise the fact of the existence and salvific efficacy of other ecclesial communities and to give a

31. Cf. the whole of n. 3 and also 20 and 22. See Thils, *Le Décret sur l'oecuménisme* (Paris, 1966), pp. 45-59. He explains: these elements of the Church are living spiritual values, which tend of themselves towards their fulfilment and accomplishment (p. 53). See also Cardinal Jaeger, *Le Décret de Vatican II sur l'Oecuménisme* (Tournai, 1965), pp. 68-77 and 151-157.

32. *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 15. This is opposed to a reductionist interpretation of *subsistit in*, an interpretation which was just what the Council fathers wished to avoid by refusing to put in "est". In the *expansio modorum* of October-November 1964 we read: "ut patet duae manifestantur tendentiae, una quae sententiam aliqua tenus extenderet, altera quae vellet eam restringere. De qua re commissio jam antea post largam disceptationem, elegit vocem 'subsistit in', cui solutioni omnes praesentes adhaeserunt" (Alberigo, *Synopsis historica*, (Bologna, 1975) p. 509).

Already the *relatio* of the doctrinal commission July 1964 had said: "quaedam verba mutantur: loco 'est' l. 21 dicitur 'subsistit in', ut expressio melius concordet cum affirmatione de elementis ecclesialibus quae alibi adsunt" (ibidem p. 440). Philips had already foreseen that this formula would make "streams of ink flow" (6. 1., p. 119). Unfortunately they have not yet flowed and that part of *Lumen Gentium*, n. 8 crucial for ecumenism, still awaits the deeper studies it deserves. Such studies should explain the two tendencies of which the *expansio modorum* speaks, what they aimed at and what was their relative importance in the Council.

33. Cf. Thils, *op. cit.*, p. 46. From the canonical or juridical point of view, you are either in communion or not.

theological explanation of that fact. Here I am not speaking directly of Orthodox Churches because there, there was a long tradition, a tradition uninterrupted even if obscured for some hundred or so years, which regarded them as true Churches in the theological sense³⁴ and placed the separation of East and West within the one Church: a separation of the east and west parts of that Church.³⁵ I am speaking of the Churches which issued from the Reformation, in order to take a new standpoint and to ensure that standpoint is consistent with the traditional Catholic faith. It is the working out of the dogmatic notion of communion which has allowed the Catholic Church to take this step. If we do not take this standpoint, we cannot understand the ecumenical commitment of the Catholic Church³⁶. But if we do, we understand why Cardinal Willebrands sees the future of ecumenism in the development of an ecclesiology of communion in all its dimensions³⁷.

It is impossible to criticize what has been done, to judge it unsatisfactory. It is not possible to deny that here was a central problem that

the Catholic Church has faced with courage and consistency and thereby laid the foundation for further progress.³⁸ The problem is also central in the World Council of Churches.³⁹ I know of no attempts made in this area which I would judge more satisfactory.

The communion which I call ontological and which others call dogmatic, has been lived and experienced in eucharistic communion. The eucharistic synaxis is not only a gathering in unity of the local assembly of the faithful communicating in the eternal life of the triune God through the body and blood of Christ. It is also the identifying in and through the Spirit of that celebrating community with all the communities which throughout the world celebrate these mysteries, and of these within the community contemplated by the seer of the Apocalypse, the apostolic community, that of the believers of all ages reunited with the apostles about the throne of "the lamb standing as though it had been slain" for the eternal heavenly liturgy, the end of history".⁴⁰ The eucharist is the source at which communion in

34. Cf. Yves Congar *Chrétiens désunis* (Paris, 1937), pp. 381-382, and *Irenikon* 1950, pp. 22-24.

35. Council of Florence, *Laelentur coeli: "aphirifai men gar to Ekklisian"* (Alberigo, *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, (Bologna, 1973), p. 524). This text is freely adapted in n. 18 *Unitatis Redintegratio*..

36. An example of this failure of understanding is: D. Ols, *Scorciatoie Ecumeniche*, *L'Osservatore Romano*, 25-26 February, 1985. See on this subject Aidan Nichols, *Einigung der Kirchen: An ecumenical controversy*, in *One in Christ* 21 (1985), pp. 139-166.

37. Article cited in note n. 29.

38. *Unitatis Redintegratio*, n. 24 where it is said that the Council does not wish "to prejudice the future inspiration of the Holy Spirit".

39. The declaration of Toronto of 1950, cf. *Evanston to New Delhi* (Geneva, 1961) pp. 245-250. The tendency of some in recent years to resume discussion on this declaration has encountered firm opposition notably from the Orthodox Churches.

40. Cf. Apoc. 5,6 and 22,1-5.

On the role of the Eucharist in ecclesial communion see Jean Zizioulas, *L'unité de l'Eglise dans la divine eucharistie et l'évêque durant les trois premiers siècles* (Athens, 1965) (in Greek).

its vertical and horizontal dimensions is unceasingly renewed and unified. In the patristic epoch "communion between Churches keeps always an interior link with the eucharist. In turn, the use of the term in its sacramental sense looks back to inter-ecclesial communion".⁴¹

But this mystery of communion, these mysteries must be celebrated in many places and in generation after generation. In proportion as the community grows and the years pass there will be the concern about harmony, about fidelity to apostolic truth and a necessary juridical dimension will be given to the community, to the several communities.⁴² But long before external forms had been found for organising unity, or union had been realised on the social level, the local Churches or communities felt themselves linked, at least when the eucharist was being celebrated, with the other Churches, spread throughout the world, in the communion of unity.⁴³ The exchanging of confessions of faith,⁴⁴ letters of communion, "a sort of ecclesiastical passport", hospitality, reciprocal visits, feast-day letters, eulogies, the gift of *fermentum*, then councils and synodical letters were the first spontaneous forms of expressing, ensuring and consolidating communion. This gift of God had to be lived out, manifested in a community "*homothymadon epi to afto*".⁴⁵ The ministry of unity, the episcopate plays a fundamental role here.

Beyond the dogmatic notion of communion, to preserve it and keep it in fidelity, we have already encountered earlier, closely mingled with it, the canonical notion of communion. It is necessary and inseparable from the first but totally at its service. I cannot examine here the various forms taken by the organisation of hierarchical communion. I have done so elsewhere.⁴⁶ I would like merely to touch here on the question of the delimitation of episcopal ministry. In the ancient Church this delimitation, or more precise indication, is found included in the actual rite of ordination for a given Church. But the question of delimitation of dioceses quickly arose.⁴⁷ On the other hand, even in the East, once the transfer of bishops from one see to another was allowed, it called for a decision by an ecclesiastical authority higher than that of the diocese. Is not this the equivalent of what in the West we call the "*missio canonica*"? What is important is that for the West as for the East we believe that episcopal ordination gives, along with the grace, the charge *to teach, to sanctify and to rule*. For Catholics this is clear in chapter III of *Lumen Gentium* and the *Nota praevia*. But these texts also affirm that the Pope gives final designation of powers which must permit their exercise. This is but "the actual expression of the communion instituted by the Lord according to a hierarchical

41. H. S. Sieben, art. cit., DS col. 1750.

42. The pastoral epistles among others already show clearly this concern or, if you like, awareness of this necessity.

43. H. J. Sieben, art. cit., col. 1751.

44. Orthodoxy of faith has always been in the forefront of criteria for granting or refusing communion.

45. Act. 1,14; 2,46; 4,24; 15,26. This theme of Acts is the heart of the book by S. Tyszkiewicz, *La Sainteté de l'Eglise christoconforme* (Rome, 1945).

46. *La structure synodale de l'Eglise dans la théologie orientale*, in *Proche Orient Chrétien*, t. 20 (Jerusalem, 1970) pp. 123-145.

47. Cf. Hervé-Marie Légrand, *Nature de l'Eglise particulière et rôle de l'évêque dans l'Eglise*, in *La charge pastorale des évêques*, *Unam Sanctam* 74 (Paris, 1969) pp. 176-219.

scheme".⁴⁸ This is done in any case by election and nomination. Is it not the same in the Orthodox Church, even though they do not speak of *missio canonica*? How and by whom are future bishops actually designated in the different autocephalous Churches? As far as I know there is no longer any election of candidates by the people or by the bishops of neighbouring dioceses.

The *Nota praevia* says "Such an ulterior norm is demanded by the nature of the case, since there is question of functions which must be exercised by several subjects working together by Christ's will in a hierarchical manner. It is clear that this "communion" has been in the life of the Church according to circumstances of the times, before it was, so to speak, codified in law.

Therefore it is significantly stated that hierarchical communion is required with the head of the Church and its members. Communion is an idea which was held in high honour by the ancient Church (as it is even today, especially in the East). It is understood, however, not as a certain vague feeling, but as an organic reality which demands a juridical form, and is simultaneously animated by charity".⁴⁹

Whether we like it or not, whether we are allergic or not to terms like "hierarchical communion" or "hierarchical communities" here is a reality received from the Lord and answering to the nature of all permanent human society however small in extent. Anarchy is a utopia, a seductive eschatological dream, leading only to anarchy. This is not to

prejudge the various ways in which hierarchical authority can be organised and ensured. Now the discussion, at a time passionate, having been calmed down, it would seem that Mgr Philips is right when he says that this *Nota praevia* in no ways restricts the scope of chapter III of the dogmatic constitution on the Church. It gives precision to the canonical requirements of hierarchical communion, the need for which is many times affirmed in chapter III. How is canonical communion organised? East and West have different traditions on this point, but they agree in asserting the need for hierarchical communion, even if they use different words. The *Nota praevia* is not at all opposed to what I am saying together with Mgr Philips: that ancient customary law and traditional oriental discipline retain for these Churches all their validity.⁵⁰ The fact remains, evidently, that the Catholic faith considers communion with the bishop of Rome as necessary. There again, we cannot at all prejudge now what that canonical communion implies or does not imply. It will be for the dialogues in progress to work that out.

However that may be (and I have alluded to it above) whether canonical communion exists or not—and unhappily between the bishop of Rome and the other Churches it does not—we know that ontological communion exists in the truth and in the realities of the mystery of salvation operating in and through the Church. That communion is "almost total" with the Orthodox Churches.⁵¹ It is real but incomplete with the other Churches and ecclesial communities not in canonical communion with the bishop of Rome.

48. Cf. Philips, t. 1, p. 274.

49. Idem, p. 270.

50. Idem, p. 290.

51. *Tomos Agapis* 283, p. 614.

Here we need to mention the very interesting study by André de Halleux,

I want to end by summing up

Ecclesial communion is realised at three levels:

1) At spiritual, invisible and definitive level, that of our life offered to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit and thus offered for our brethren. To serve this reality is the reason, more or less immediate, for the other levels. It was from this point of view that Paul VI could say at Bethlehem that the barriers of our divisions do not reach up to heaven. This communion results from the gift of the Spirit. That is why it is said to be at the *spiritual* level. It is He who is the source of ecclesial communion at this level and hence at the other two. Thus it can be said that ecclesial communion is truly the "fellowship of the Holy Spirit". Communion at this level is said to be *invisible* to distinguish it from the other levels. There is no question of undervaluing the influence of a life lived according to the Spirit by each believer and each community and the witness which such a life constitutes. "The tree is known by its fruit".⁵²

To say that this communion is *definitive* is to point to the eschatological reality already present.

2) At the visible level of community within which and through which God's liberating and sanctifying action takes place. The unity of this community is a condition of its fulfilling its mission. Ecclesial unity is achieved through the acceptance and active reception of the elements making up the unity of the community: common profession of the apostolic faith, sacramental life, coordination of community life by those who have been given the ministry of word and sacrament and the charge to preside over the life of the community.

3) At the canonical or juridical level where an organising of the unity of the community takes place to ensure that the different members (who have rights and duties at different levels) live in brotherly harmony and in fidelity to "the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints"⁵³. Here there can be many different juridical regimes giving practical expression to the same dogmatic truth (here lies the chief objection to the possibility of a "fundamental law"). This third level is closely linked with the preceding one, to which it lends organisation, but it has not the same necessity, given that it can be realised in various forms.

Fraterna communio (Irenikon, t. LVIII 1985, pp. 291-311) and his article: *Les principes catholiques de l'oecuménisme, quelques réflexions* (Revue théologique de Louvain, n. 16, 1985, pp. 316-350) which I got to know about after this study has been written. In the first study mentioned, André de Halleux understands hierarchical communion more in the sense of a hierarchical structured communion than in that of communion between hierarchs which is the sense we have given to it in these pages. Consequently he suggests that we aim rather at a "fraternal communion" than at a "hierarchical communion", with the Orthodox Churches. In this connection, see or reflexions *Primus inter Pares* (Documentation Catholique, t. LXX 1973, pp. 29-31). The word "hierarchy" seems to have entered the Christian vocabulary with Pseudo-Dionysius who seems to have created it. It then spread in the VIIth century (Maximus, Sophronius). It entered ecclesiastical Latin only with the translation of Dionysius in the IXth century. It then has a fine innings.

52. Mt. 12,33.

53. Jude 3.

Hierarchical communion is often placed in this context. This is well enough if we are merely considering the canonical manner in which hierarchical relations are organised in the concrete. It will not do if we are estimating the *necessity* of these relations, if we are looking at how the communion between local Churches (the communion necessary to their very being) is articulated, and abstracting from the different ways in which hierarchical relations can be realised and organised in practice. Understood in this latter way hierarchical communion is to be seen as an important element at our *second* level of communion, that which I have called ontological.

Hierarchical communion shows how juridical or canonical communion is closely linked to ontological communion. I would say that ontological communion always implies a minimum of juridical or canonical communion but that the latter is not invariable and is always open to certain diversity whether with different communities or at different periods. The discernment needed here is always very delicate: it calls for great pastoral prudence. There is always the risk in changing certain forms of altering the

essential which are there to be put into working order. We are always tempted to give absolute value to what we are used to, even to consider as apostolic usages which may have only a few decades behind them. To be rooted in the essential is, here as elsewhere, the measure of freedom.

In using the term communion we need to be aware of this complexity so as to avoid ambiguities.

Communion is founded on the gifts of God. It is an objective reality. It is realised in charity, but that does not at all diminish the importance of its foundation. It would be very reductionist to place communion first at the affective level. "Koinonia puts the accent on the interior value which takes account of unity and on what is shared in common...". The *societas* often designates the external ties, the web of relations which thereby unite Christians... Everything in the mystery of the Church is built around koinonia in what God in Christ has given once for all.⁵⁴

Once again, among Christians, whether we like it or not, we are brothers.

Pierre Duprey

54. Jean M. R. Tillard, art. cit., col. 1759 and 1761.

The New Vision of the Role of Authority in the Church According to Vatican II

Pope John XXIII of happy memory took the courageous step to convene the Second Vatican Council for the renewal and reunion of the Church. He firmly believed that the best means for reconciliation and reunion of the churches is their genuine renewal. The date he chose to announce the news of the council to the Christian world was January 25, the Feast of the Conversion of St Paul and the concluding day of the Church Unity Octave. The Pope was convinced of the need and urgency "to shake of the dust that has gathered on the throne of St Peter from the time of Constantine."¹ What is that dust which cast shade on the ecclesiastical leadership and disfigured the true image of the Church? The success of the process of renewal and reunion of the Churches largely depends on our ability to rediscover the true nature of the Church and the authentic role of its leadership.

The Church is the people of God who consist of saints and sinners. These people are subject to defects and tarnished by time. Hence the Church has to be freed from the man-made accretions. This liberating and purifying process needs a proto-type as the model. We can discover it only by returning to the authentic sources

of the Church. The biblical, patristic, liturgical and historical studies conducted from the beginning of the 20th century set a positive background for rediscovering the true nature of the Church from its authentic sources. The Church in India, I believe has a unique role to play in this process of rediscovery.

I. Unique Role of the Church in India

Christianity is Asian in its origin. Its original thought patterns and categories are deeply rooted in the socio-cultural and religious background of the place where it had its origin.

The Indus Valley Civilization and its Sumerio-Dravidian affinity link us with the biblical background. Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias says: "... it is quite likely that the Sumerian founders of Babylon were themselves of the Dravidian stock".¹ William Foxwell Albright, a well known authority on Biblical archaeology also speaks about the close parallelism between the Indus Valley civilization and the Sumerian culture.² Ur emerged from the capital city of the Sumerians, one of the oldest civilizations of the world. The Sumerians are not Semites.³

According to the available sources

-
1. E. B. Havell, *History of Aryan Rule in India*, London, 1918 p. 129. ed. 2.
 2. William Foxwell Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, Doubleday & Company Inc., Garden City, New York (1957) p. 30.
 3. Werner Keller, *The Bible History*, transl. by William Neil, Hodder and Stoughton, London, Sydney, Auckland, Toronto, (1914), pp. 43-44.

and the living tradition, the origin and growth of Christianity in India are intimately linked with the Churches of the Middle East. The Sumerio-Dravidian affinity, linguistic links⁴, territorial vicinity, commercial relations etc. have contributed their share in moulding the identity of the Church in India.

As we learn from the history of the Church, when the persecuted Church became the official religion of the Roman Empire, it began to assume the thought patterns and organizational structures from the new set up. The cultural superiority of Greece influenced her doctrinal formulations while the political importance of Rome reflected in her organizational and administrative systems within the Roman Empire. On the other hand the churches which existed outside this Graeco-Roman influence did succeed to a great extent in preserving their original structures until they came under the Graeco-Roman influence at a relatively later period.

The Christianity in India which has its roots in the earliest traditions of the Church, outside the Graeco-Roman world, has a unique role to play in the Conciliar process of returning to the sources and rediscovering the authentic nature and identity of the Church of Christ. The Church loses its authentic heritage and uniqueness if it is uprooted from her own genuine sources. The Church in India has a great role to play in this context of returning to the sources.

II. Structures of authority being challenged

Why have the structures of ecclesiastical authority become an object of much criticism during and after the Vatican II? Is it a symptom of weakness or of creative thinking? Does the present tendency to evaluate some of the traditional structures functioning of ecclesiastical authority create a kind of insecurity and confusion?

The Second Vatican Council stands out in the history of Ecumenical Councils, with its own particular end in view, the renewal of the Church. If the earlier Councils were pre-occupied with the question of strictly formulating the doctrines of the Church and condemning those who were not prepared to abide by them, Vatican II is primarily intended for renewal and restoration of Christian unity. We have to renew what is tarnished by time and restore what is lost. It is an unquestionable sociological truth that the successes and failures of any collective undertaking largely depend on its leadership. The leadership is always the dynamic source of inspiration and strength for the whole society. Hence it is quite natural that in this period of renewal much of the ecclesiological thinking is centred on the nature and structure of the leadership in the Church.

Ecclesiologists and historians observe that during the course of centuries the idea of Christian authority has come under many unhealthy influences⁵. The various canonical

4. Nangachiveettil Thomas N. A., *St. Thomas Churches of Asia* (Malayalam), Vol. I, Trivandrum, (1982) p. 49.
5. Some of the recent literature on this subject: John M. Todd, (ed) *Problems of Authority*, London, (1964); John Dalrymple and others, *Authority in a Changing Church*, London 1966. The following book indirectly deals with the problems of authority in the light of obedience: Karl Rahner and others, *Obedience and the Church*, London, 1968; Robert Markus and E. John, *Papacy and Hierarchy*, London, 1969; Edmund Hill, art. 'Authority in the

collections are not exception to this strange development. The consequences are far-reaching. The problem at present does not seem to be a question of denial of authority but the quest to explicate the genuine concept of authority which Jesus Christ wanted to be exercised in His Church.

The following observation of Edmund Hill seems to be relevant in this context:

"But critical situations in the past have usually arisen either from rival claims to authority, e. g. the great schism of the west; or from denials of the lawfulness of a particular authority, e. g. the reformation; or from an anarchistic denial of the lawfulness of authority in general, e. g. the German Anabaptists of the sixteenth century. The present crisis takes none of these forms; authority is being neither claimed nor denied, but its nature and the manner of its exercise are being critically examined. It has perhaps been too long taken for granted by Catholics that authority is a clear and distinct idea..."⁶.

Pope Paul VI reminded the bishops of Italy about the unhealthy situation and the attitude of the people towards the style of episcopal authority:

"What is to be the style of such (episcopal) authority? ... It is clear, for example, that in a former day, especially when pastoral authority was associated with secular authority (the staff and sword in the same hand), the characteristics of a bishop were overlordship, external pomp, dignity, at times privilege, arbitrariness, and sumptuousness. In earlier times, these traits did not give scandal; the people liked to see in their bishop a figure of greatness, power, pomp, and majesty. *Today it is not and cannot be so.* Far from admiring, people are disagreeably surprised and scandalized if a bishop is excessively preoccupied with anachronistic marks of his office, and they remind him of the gospel... a sober and dignified outward way of life is possible and required by the office. But let us thank God that we have put aside so many worldly externals"⁷.

III. Authority in the New Testament

The normal Greek word for authority in the New Testament is *exousia*⁸. It means lawful authority, or the situation in which one is able, competent or permitted to perform an action. The word 'competence' seems to be the best English equivalent. It means the state of freedom of a person to act what is right and communicate it to others⁹. It is not mere

Church' in the *Clergy Review* (1965), pp. 619-628 and '*Development of Institutions*', *ibid* pp. 674-685, Yves Congar, *Power and Poverty in the Church*, London, (1964); Hans Küng historically and critically analyses the nature, meaning and function of authority in the Church in the following works: *The Structures of the Church*, London, (1965); *The Church* London, 1967; Peter Hebblethwaite, '*Towards a Church of Service*' in *The Way* Oct. (1966) pp. 275-283.

6. Edmund Hill, *Authority in the Church*, in *Clergy Review*, London, 1966, pp. 619-628

7. AAS 58, (1966), pp. 68-69.

8. See the detailed etymological analysis of the Greek word *exousia* by Foerster in *Theological Dictionary of N. Testament*, G. Kittel (ed) transl. by G. W. Bromiley, Vol. II Michigan, (1968), pp. 560-575.

9. Cfr. Robert Murray and others, article on '*Authority and Spirit in the New Testament*' in the book *Authority in a Changing Church*, London, (1968), pp. 32-33.

power over others but the rightful freedom to do what is genuinely right.

The Latin word for *exousia* is *potestas*. It is used 102 times in the New Testament¹⁰. It means 'lawful authority'. Though the word *auctoritas* (authority) is sometimes used in the ecclesiastical documents *potestas* is the proper word used in the N. Testament: to denote *potestas exousia*. *Potestas* is distinct from *potentia* which means sheer power. In the New Testament *exousia* does not have the connotation of dominion over others¹¹.

The *exousia* which is given by Christ to his Church is Trinitarian in its origin. Its source is God the Father. "As the Father has sent me even so I send you"¹². "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations..."¹³. This *exousia* is for sharing the divine life which was communicated to Christ in its fulness before the beginning of time.

During His public ministry Jesus made use of His *exousia* on different occasions: "But that you may know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins"¹⁴. He manifests it in His teaching: "He taught them as one who had authority, and not as their scribes"¹⁵. The Son shares the life of the Father and has His authority from the Father. "For as

the Father has life in Himself, so He has granted the Son also to have life in Himself, and has given Him authority to execute judgement, because He is the Son of man"¹⁶. The laying down of his life for others is in tune with his *exousia*: "No one takes it (life) from me, but I lay it down on my own accord. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again; this charge I have received from my Father"¹⁷. All forms of authority are derived from the *ousia* of the Father. The whole authority of the Church and the world is dependent on Christ Jesus who has it in its fulness.

The giving of the Holy Spirit to the disciples was also the sharing of the divine *exousia*¹⁸. This Spirit which is the Spirit of Christ continues to be the life-giving principle of the Church. It was given to the whole Church, according to the distribution of the Spirit¹⁹. This Spirit has made the disciples the children of God. As the true sharers of Christ's *exousia* every disciple is made an adopted son in Christ.

The life of the Church, which is Trinitarian in its origin, is a Spirit-filled reality. The Spirit of the Risen Lord is ever operative in his Body, the Church. Openness and freedom are distinctive characters of the Spirit. Hence Paul says "Where the Spirit, is, there is freedom"²⁰. This Spirit cannot be stifled²¹. The eternal Spirit

10. Cfr. Edmund Hill, art. cit. p. 620.

11. Ibidem, p. 622.

12. Jn 20:21

13. Mt 28:18-19; Lk 12:5.

14. Mt 9:6.

15. Mt 7:29.

16. Jn 5:26-27; Rom 13:1.

17. Jn 10:18.

18. Jn 20:22; Acts 8:19.

19. 1 Cor 12:4f.

20. 2 Cor 3:17.

21. 1 Thess 5:19.

of God with its all-embracing inner effusiveness unites men and leads them to the fulness of life and freedom. The Church as a Spirit directed reality is there to help men grow into the communion of exousia of the Spirit of God.

IV Trinitarian Communion: And Christian Ministry

The Church is the community of those who are reborn into the Trinitarian life. The Trinitarian formula of baptism points to this basic truth. The newly baptized person is being led into the life of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The entire ecclesial ministry is to promote this Trinitarian life among the People of God.

In Gen. 1:26 we see that man was created in God's image. "Let us make man in our image after our likeness" God is not an abstract concept. There is a profound communion among the three persons. The dynamic interpersonal love exists among them. The perfection of one person requires fellowship with another²². In the case of God the 'third' with whom the other two share their mutual love is the Holy Spirit. It is a '*perichoresis*' (coinherence, mutual indwelling, reciprocity, literally: cyclical movement) of the three Persons entirely open to the others. From all eternity Father says to the Son "You are my beloved Son" (Mk 1:11). From all eternity the Son replies "Abba Father" (Rom 8:15). From all eternity the Spirit sets his seal upon this interchange²³.

The three persons of the Trinity act in the creation of man. Thus the image of God within us is a Trinitarian image. God has a social expression in man, and humanity. The

Church exists to realize this triune likeness in humanity. God became man to reveal this outpouring love through his self-effacing sacrificial life. He was open to all in his love after the Trinitarian image. Hence Jesus prayed: "that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. The glory which thou hast given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and thou in me, that they may become perfectly one, so that the world may know that thou hast sent and hast loved them even as thou hast loved me" (Jn 17:21-23).

God became man to share this life in its fullness: "I came that they may have life and have it abundantly". The *only source of this life* is the Trinity. Through baptism the reborn person is made a sharer of this life. The whole ministry of the Church is for fostering it in every member of the Church after the Trinitarian image.

V. Ecclesial Society: its structural evolution

The author of the Acts of the Apostles shows us how the Kingdom first preached to the Jews, had become the good news also to others. There was the first community under the leadership of the Apostles. They felt the need of devoting themselves fully to the preaching of the Gospel. Hence, at their request, the believers elected seven men of good repute whom the Apostles approved and accepted for the ministry "with the laying of their hands on them".²⁴ The

22. Cfr. Kallistos of Diokleia, "The Human Person as an Icon of the Trinity", *Sobornost*, vol. 8, No. 2 (1986), p. 9.

23. Cfr. Ibidem p. 12.

24. Cfr. Acts 6: 1-6.

pneumatic aspect was very evident in the ecclesial life. The early Christians were immensely joyful and wanted to share their faith with others.

In their turn the Apostles went to different countries and founded local Churches. Their experience of the Christ-event was the heritage of these Churches which they founded. These were concrete manifestations of the Christian faith expressed by the Apostles in particular socio-cultural contexts. The universal Church consisted of the communion of these individual Churches.

In the beginning the Apostles were the highest authority in the Church. There were also the Elders (presbyteroi) and Overseers (episkopoi). In Jewish society the Council of Elders exercised office collectively. The Elders and Overseers were ordained to their ministry by the rite of laying of hands of them.²⁵ They were the stewards of the mysteries of Christ. This structure gradually assumed new forms when the Church became the official religion of the Roman Empire.

a) *The Church the official religion of the Roman Empire*

In the fourth century the Church became the official religion of the

Roman Empire. Yves Congar in his historical survey of this evolution makes the following observation.²⁶

"The clergy were given important privileges, the bishops became *illustri*, and for all practical purposes ranked with the senators. They were invested with public authority within the framework of the Empire, even in the sphere of secular life of the cities ... The bishops frequently called on the imperial authority for support... Under these circumstances, we ought perhaps to expect that authority would change its character and that it would acquire a more secular, much more juridical meaning, based on the relation of superior to subordinate"²⁷.

The introduction of special dress for the clergy was another development in this line of separation from the laity.²⁸

b) *The Introduction of territorial jurisdiction*

This was an important event in the evolution of the government of the local Churches. The territorial administrative system of the Church was closely allied with the civil administration of the Roman Empire. The

25. Acts 14:23.

26. Yves Congar, 'The Historical Development of Authority' in the *Problems of Authority* ed. by John M. Todd, op. cit., p. 128.

27. Yves Congar, *ibid.* p. 135, cautiously points out the contrast between the church of the martyrs and the Church of the Empire: "Thus whilst in the Church of the Martyrs there was a tension not inside the Church, between the various categories of Christians, but between the ecclesia and the world, thenceforth within a society entirely Christian, tension grew inside the Church or within Christian society between monks or priests on the one hand and laymen on the other".

28. The introduction of special clerical uniform initiated a considerable change in the relation of the clergy with the laity. Yves Congar, *ibid.* p. 135, foot-note No. 4: In 428, Pope Celestine (422-432) "upbraided Honoratus, abbot of Lerins, who had been appointed Bishop of Arles, for introducing a special dress namely the tunic and belt. This was the monastic habit and an innovation. Hitherto, the dress of priests had been exactly the same as that of other men. Even in the celebration of the

Roman Emperor Diocletian had divided the Empire into prefectures, dioceses and provinces. The diocese was an administrative district of the Empire. The sixth canon of the first Council of Nicaea speaks about the territorial division of the ancient Churches.²⁹ The bishops of a particular province used to gather together and discuss their common problems in the councils. The ecclesiastical head of a province had the name of Metropolitan. With the granting of political favours and privileges the Pastoral office of the bishops began to be called jurisdiction, a term from Roman law. A new distinction was gradually made between the power of jurisdiction and the power of order.³⁰ It was subsequent to the Decretum Gratiani. The introduction of the word hierarchy marks a new attitude towards the ecclesiastical authority.³¹

c) *The patriarchal system of government*

This was the spontaneous development of the ecclesial relations of the early centuries. The Metropolitans of the important ecclesiastical centres became the head of their own individual Churches. The Patriarchal centres were Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Jerusalem. By the fifth century the Persian Church also developed into a Patriarchate. According to the ancient traditions of the Eastern Churches the Patriarch with

the Permanent Synod of Bishops constituted the highest authority of an individual Church. Letters of communion were exchanged mutually among these Patriarchs. The Eastern Churches freely elected their own Patriarchs and regulated their discipline, liturgy and ecclesial life. The Pope was the Bishop of Rome variously designated Metropolitan of the Roman Province, Primate of Italy, Patriarch of the Western Church and head of the Patriarchs.

d) *The Pope: King of the Papal States*

From the middle of the eighth century to the second half (754–1870) of the nineteenth the Pope was also the King of the Papal States in Central Italy. Historians point out four reasons for their formation³². The Lombard wars, the weakness of the Byzantine emperors, religious disputes and the alliance between the Papacy and Franks. Through the donations of wealthy men the Papacy became the largest landholder in Italy. This territory was known as the Patrimony of St Peter. The papal influence was on the increase for the defence of Italy from invaders. In 754 Pope Stephen cast off the semblance of allegiance to the Emperor of Constantinople by signing a political treaty with the Franks. It was indeed a turning point in the history

Liturgy they merely wore clean clothes. Celestine wrote to the bishops of Narbonne province: We should be distinguished from others not by our dress but by our knowledge, by our behaviour and manner of life" (P. L. 50, 431).

29. C. Kirch, *Enchiridion Historiae Antiquae*, No. 406.

30. Klaus Morsdorf, article on *Jurisdiction in Sacramentum Mundi*, Vol. III, pp. 229–31.

31. Robert Markus, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–16: The author explains historically the background of the introduction of the word "hierarchy" in the Church. He seems to attribute it to a Syrian monk who wrote around the year 500 under the name of Dionysius the Arcopagite.

32. Neil and Schmandt, *History of the Catholic Church*, Milwaukee, 1957, p. 134.

of the Papacy and the whole of Europe.

e) *Separation between the East and the West*

Tensions had already developed in the relations between the papacy and the other ancient Patriarchal Churches. In the eleventh century the official separation between the Churches of Constantinople and Rome took place. It had its climax in mutual excommunications which paved the way for unilateral development in the East as well as the West. Rome began to create more Latin Patriarchates even in the East. The Crusaders from the West were the agents and valiant promoters of the Latin form of Christianity in the East. Many of the churches and shrines of the Eastern churches were plundered and the relics taken to the West. All these atrocities added fuel to the fire. The East was alienated from the West. Meanwhile the papacy grew into a great Western political force. The councils and canonical collections of the Latin Church of the subsequent centuries were mainly based on Western traditions³³. The absence of the Eastern Churches was conspicuous. While all the ecumenical Councils of the first millennium were convoked in the East the councils of the second millennium were exclusively conducted in the West.

Against this background the Roman Curia developed into a great organization on a monarchical pattern. Its various offices gradually began to deal with the problems of the other Churches. The fourth Lateran Council and the subsequent organizational developments of the Roman Church

bear ample evidence to the all-embracing centralizing tendency of the Roman Church. The various Roman Congregations which came into existence during this period constitute the backbone of this structure. This tendency of a centralized system of government continued upto Vatican II. But mainly owing to the need of decentralization and the atmosphere of ecumenical openness fostered by Pope John XXIII and his successors some changes are noticeable. It is to be hoped that these may create an atmosphere for a more balanced relationship between the East and the West³⁴.

Vatican II admits the need of decentralization and the right of self-government of the Churches:

"History, tradition, and numerous ecclesiastical institutions manifest luminously how much the universal Church is indebted to the Eastern Churches. This Sacred Synod therefore, not only honours this ecclesiastical and spiritual heritage with merited esteem and rightful place, but also unhesitatingly looks upon it as the heritage of Christ's universal Church. For this reason, it solemnly declares that the Churches of the East, as much as those of the West, fully enjoy the right, and are duty bound to rule themselves" (OE 5) cfr. also UR 16.

This brief historical survey is intended to have an idea of the development of Church authority during the course of centuries. The structural evolution of the Church is the outcome of these ideological attitudes and approaches.

33. Yves Congar analyses the problem of the ecumenicity of the ecumenical councils of the second millennium in a richly documented article "*Church Structures and Councils*" in the review *One in Christ*, 1975, No. 3, pp. 224-266.

34. Decree of Vatican II on Oriental Churches, art. 5.

VI The Christian concept of Authority

There are instances where the Apostles revealed their ambition for power and prestige. For them Messiah was a glorious king who would liberate the Chosen People from a foreign yoke and establish a triumphant kingdom of their own. The sons of Zebedee with their mother provide a typical example of this quest for power and recognition in the new kingdom. The evangelists Mathew, Mark and Luke narrate this incident (Mt 20, 20-28; Mk 10, 35-45; Lk 22, 24-27). To their request for privileged positions Our Lord gives the answer:

"You know that rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but who ever be great among you must be your servant, and who ever be first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many"³⁵.

It is clear that the "authority" which Christ gave is not of the pattern of civil authority. Before Pilate, Christ asserted that His power was not of a worldly kind³⁶. The pagan rulers governed their subjects with their power and pomp. Their dominion was maintained by legal sanctions and a well-disciplined army which saw that the laws were observed and that those who went against them were punished. The territorial divisions of the kingdom and the legal co-ordination and subordination of all those who were put in charge

of maintaining law and order constituted the juridical structure of the kingdom. The subjects had to obey them and follow their lead. This kind of discipline is explained by the centurion "For I am a man set under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, "Go", and he goes, and to another "Come", and he comes; and to my slave "Do this" and he does it"³⁷.

But Jesus said that it should not be so among his followers. The leaders among the Christians should be their servants.³⁸ Christ put himself forward as the model. The self-emptying of Christ manifested at Bethlehem reached its peak on the altar of Calvary. This is the model he prescribed to those who are appointed to be leaders among his followers. The Evangelist's statement that he went about doing good reveals his disposition and attitude to others.

In the first Letter of St Peter, its author is well aware of the particular nature of authority among the Christians. He advises the co-elders to be on their guard against the temptation to get power, prestige, and privileges. He wrote to them telling to "Tend the flock of God that is in your charge, not by constraint but willingly, not for shameful gain but eagerly, not as domineering over those in your charge but by being examples to the flock"³⁹. St Paul calls himself and his collaborators "the stewards of the mysteries of Christ"⁴⁰.

Stewards do not possess authority⁴¹. They administer it in the name

35. Mt 20:25-28.

36. Jn 18:36

37. Lk 7:8

38. John L. McKenzie, *Authority in the Church*, London, (1966), p. 11-13.

39. I Pet. 5:2-3

40. I Cor. 4:1-2

41. Yves Congar, *op. cit.* p. 122. The author analyses the ministerial role of authority: "We possess nothing: there is only one dominus the Lord, who

of the person whom they serve. The conferment of stewardship does not guarantee that all the steward's doings will be approved by his master. He should take the maximum care that the lordship of his master is always maintained. Secondly, the steward should know that he is entitled to administer affairs only according to the will of his master. He has no right to act against the interests of his lord. If he does he abuses his stewardship and acts against the very intention of the master.

In the Church, the ministers are "stewards of the mysteries of Christ". They do not possess authority, but administer it. The ministers in the Church have their authority from Christ. He is the only owner of authority. "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me"⁴². Authority in the Church is that which was given by its founder. Secondly, this authority was intended for the benefit of others⁴³. As stewards they are the dispensers of the new economy of salvation and messengers of the world of God. They are appointed for others "ex-hominibus assumptus et pro hominibus constituitur"⁴⁴. Thirdly, as Christ's stewards, they have to act faithfully according to the will of Christ. They have no right to act against the explicit command of the Lord, Jesus Christ. Their ministry should necessarily be meas-

ured by the standards established by Christ. Fourthly they should always be well aware of the fact that it is the continued action of the spirit of Christ which renders their ministry meaningful and valid. Jesus Christ is not at all like a master who gives authority to his stewards and then goes away leaving the entire administration and responsibility to them. In every sacramental act of the Church Christ continues to be the One who works behind the scenes. When Peter baptized, it was Christ who baptized. When a minister celebrates the Eucharist, it is Christ who is the real celebrant. Thus Christ's continued and effective presence cannot be ignored in and behind the ministerial role of the "stewards of the mysteries of Christ".

Thus authority in the Church is really holy (hiera) in its origin, goal, conditions, and exercise.

VII Teaching and Witnessing

Jesus Christ commissioned his disciples to proclaim the good news through their word and witness. He taught them to believe and set the example. "You be my witnesses"⁴⁵.

His life confirmed his teaching. The same method was prescribed to his disciples also. "For I have given you an example, that you also should do as I have done to you. Truly,

established the various offices, distributing his gifts to each one individually according to his will I Cor. 12, 4-7. Hence there cannot be any *dominatio*, any possession, any spirit of possessiveness. Hence the law of the Christian life is that we should consider ourselves as stewards of God; gifts which are for the good of all: "as every man has received grace ministering the same one to another: as good stewards of the manifold grace of God" (I Pet 4:10; cfr. Gal 5:13; Rom 15:14; I Cor 9:19-23; 2 Cor. 1:4; 5:5; Col. 3:16; I Thess. 3:16; Hebr. 3:13; 10:24-25.

42. Mt. 28:19

43. St Augustine used to remind his flock: *Vobis sum episcopus, vobiscum christianus*, Sermo, 340, I (P. L. 38, 1483) cfr also sermo 56, II, 135, 7).

44. Hebr. 5:1.

45. Acts 1:8; Lk 24:48

truly, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his master; nor is he who is sent greater than he who sent him. If you know these things, *blessed are you if you do them*"⁴⁶. The authority in the Church becomes genuine and credible and blessed by Christ as much as it is exercised after the model given by Christ. Teaching can never be separated from its witness. Teaching without witness is a counter-witness!

There is a constant temptation to consider the ecclesiastical ministry after the pattern of secular authority. This temptation was evident from the very beginning itself. But Jesus corrected it in very clear terms. "It shall not be so among you" As we have seen already, in the history of the Church there are plenty of examples where many leaders failed to understand Jesus' explicit command in this regard.

Christian religion cannot be reduced to a set of well-formulated doctrines and well organized structures. Church consists of the disciples of Jesus Christ. A faithful disciple understands, appreciates, and assimilates Christ's teaching and makes earnest efforts to have more disciples for the Master. This earnestness qualifies him for his ecclesial ministry.

An Asian mind cannot be satisfied merely by the juridical titles or legal claims of an ecclesiastical authority! The cravings of his soul have to be satisfied. The saints and sages who set excellent examples live in their hearts. Living witness is more appealing and convincing than well-formulated doctrines.

VIII. Law is not a substitute for love

The Church has its own laws. But, its basic law is love. It is indeed miserable to view the Church merely in terms of law⁴⁷. The function of authority in the Church is to foster and maintain unity in charity. The ministers of the Church are the presidents and promoters of love. The restoration of the world in Christ has to be achieved by means of this unity in charity. As a servant of the people of God authority in the Church has the role of promoting unity in love. "Love, not law, is the basic constitution of the Church; if love fails, law is no substitute"⁴⁸. Law is not part of Paul's preaching. Yet he speaks about the law of Christ and the law of Spirit in Christ Jesus. He finds himself responsible to Christ as a steward⁴⁹.

The New Testament is not a new set of laws;⁵⁰ it is Jesus Himself and

46. Jn 13:15-17

47. Yves Congar, op. cit. p. 140: "In short, legalism is characteristic of an ecclesiology unrelated to spiritual anthropology, and for which the word ecclesia indicates not so much the body of the faithful as the system, the apparatus, the impersonal depositary of the system of rights whose representatives are the clergy or, as it is now called, the hierarchy, and ultimately the Pope and the Roman Curia. It is a fact that" Church is sometimes understood by the theorists of ecclesiastical power or papal authority as indicating clerics, priests and the Pope.

48. Cfr. J. L. Mckenzie, op. cit. p. 116

49. Cfr. John Dalrymple and others, op. cit. 35

50. Robert Murray, op. cit. p. 16. The author analyses the historical background of the strange development of ecclesiastical power in the West: A fateful development came in the twelfth to the thirteenth centuries when Churchmen began to adopt the secular term 'jurisdiction' which belonged to Roman civil law, and the authority of Christ's commission came to be

not a code of precepts, who provides the norm of life. The New Law is essentially based on love, and mutual love is the distinguishing mark of the Christian Community. "A new commandment I give you, that you also love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another"⁵¹. The mission of the Church is to present Christ in living witness. The primary preoccupation of Church ministers should be to become authentic messengers of Christ's love by living according to the Gospel rather than to reduce Christ's teaching to subtle and precise doctrinal formulations. There is no greater bond of unity among men than that which is based on love. The communion in Spirit is the real unity among the followers of Christ. It is the "same Spirit and the varieties of service... it is the same God who inspires them all in every one."⁵² Paul does not hesitate to be the champion and preacher of love which is the supreme law of the Church⁵³.

The Gospel is a covenant and it extends the invitation to all for communion with God which is to be manifested in unity and love among the followers of the Gospel. This goal can be achieved only by genuine love which is not a product of legal en-

forcement by leaders, but the natural outcome of the freedom of the Spirit. It is for this goal that the Apostle advised the Ephesians: "I, therefore, a prisoner of the Lord, beg you to lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called... forbearing one another in love, eager to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace"⁵⁴.

When the nature and the mission of the Church are made clear, the function of authority in her becomes evident. She is a divine institution and her authority is necessarily divine. This divine aspect should not be limited to a part of the Church as the whole of her is animated by the Holy Spirit. The Church, we know, is the Body of Christ. Among the members of the Church, the difference is in the functions⁵⁵. We should not make a duality between the Church and authority in the Church. As the whole Church is divine the function of authority is also divine. The members of the Church should see Jesus Christ in all the members. This reciprocal seeing of Christ constitutes the Christian community of love. The function of authority in the Church is to maintain this unity in the Spirit in the bond of love and to lead all to the Freedom of the Children of God.

Paurastya Vidyāpīṭham
Pontifical Oriental Institute of
Religious Studies, Vadavathoor,
Kottayam - 686 010

Xavier Koodapuzha

split up into the power of jurisdiction and the power of order...the stage was set for an ecclesiology which saw authority in the Church as power that could be brought under the same general headings as civil authority".

51. Jn 13:34-35.

52. I Cor. 12:4-11.

53. Cfr. I Cor. 13.

54. Eph. 4:1-3.

55. I Cor. 12:11f.

Problems and Prospects of Ecumenism in the Eastern Catholic Churches

I would like in this paper to underline three aspects that pertain to the Catholic Churches of the Eastern tradition.

In the first place I recall that those Churches are a reality within the more universal Church. Then we shall examine how far their Oriental character still prevails. In the third place, the ecumenical prospects of such Churches will be surveyed.

I. The Reality of the Eastern Catholic Churches

Despite all kind of obstacles and difficulties, those churches exist indeed. There are no exceptions. Their voice, though often feeble, was heard during the long months of Vatican II. But not only there. They exist owing to their apostolic origins, often parallel to the Petrine claims.

They are not mere 'rites': as alas! there has been an ever recurring tendency to call them. This is a Latin way of speaking. In certain circles, even official ones, this way is apparently unchangeable... Neither are they mere appendices of a Church, which, though worldwide, has remained overwhelmingly western and therefore Latin, or at least of Latin origin.

Even the word 'particular' in the phrase often used now, rather untraditionally, to designate the components of the Church Universal, could be objected to. For those Eastern Catholic Churches are not particularized as far as geographical boundaries are concerned. It might

have been the case in the past. It is no more true today. They are no more bound to a particular territory, region or even culture.

It is a fact that in several cases Catholics of the Oriental tradition often feel closer to the Orthodox who belong to the same ethos. They share nearly everything with the Orthodox side. One concrete example could be taken as a symbol of such proximity. In Beyrouth both the Greek-Melkite Orthodox cathedral and the Greek-Melkite Catholic cathedral stand (or stood...) side by side, only separated by a wall. The faithful in one church could eventually answer the deacon chanting the *ektenia* on the other side. Inter-communion among these people existed long before Vatican II.

The Oriental Catholics are so real as members of the Eastern tradition that they can be the target of anti-Oriental propaganda, if not of sheep-stealing from the Latin side. In this respect Orientals were never asked to give or not to give their consent for the erection of Latin dioceses in their midst. This happened when there were only 500 Latin people to be looked after, or 1,500 (now 3,500) like in Irak with the vicar apostolic of Baghdad. In such cases one gathers the impression that the Latin prelate was sent to oversee the Orientals...

The latter exist so much that when they emigrate abroad and are left to themselves in their new land, they are often baited to join either the local catholics, mostly Latin, or even some protestant body or another.

In Canada alone about 100,000 Ukrainians belong today to the Latin dioceses (Act. Synod, Vatican II, V. III/I, p. 21, n. 4.)

An additional proof of the existence of the Eastern Catholic churches is the Vatican II Decree dealing with them. As we all know the very concept of such a Decree was very much questioned, particularly by the Oriental bishops themselves. If finally it prevailed it was due to the need of insisting on such a reality.

The perseverance with which Eastern Catholics lying under difficult circumstances, which sometimes amount to persecution lasting for a long time, succeeded in keeping their identity, even if it came down to a mere sociological one, confirms our conviction that those churches which are both Catholic and Oriental, are a deep seated reality.

During the discussions on the above-mentioned Vatican II decree much time was spent on insisting on the liberty for non-Catholic - Eastern Christians to choose whatever 'rite' they want. Such an insistence came mostly, though not exclusively, from some Latin members. Whereas it showed from their part a typical Western mentality e. g. speaking of 'rites', they at least admitted the very existence of the Oriental Catholics. For in the eyes of the protagonists of such a type of liberty, the choice of the would be Catholic was obvious. He would become either an Oriental Catholic following his own tradition, or a Latin.

II. The Character of the Eastern Catholic Churches

One of the main reasons why quite a few Eastern members at Vatican II did not like to have a special decree on their churches was the impression it gave of Latin paternalism. The Catholic Church is overwhelmingly

Latin, and therefore out of her generous heart she concedes a place in her structures to those small communities called the Oriental Catholics.

It would also confirm that Vatican II was still so Western a council that it found it impossible to integrate the Oriental outlook and presence in its constitution on the Church (Coptic patriarch Sidarous, *ibid.* v. III/IV p. 531). It was also the case as far as the patriarch was concerned. The patriarchate is more than an ordinary human creation. The apostolic character was mentioned during the debates on the decree (*ibid.* p. 506), but it was left out of the final text. If the patriarchal institution had been integrated, together with the synod, in the Constitution on the Church, it would have put the figure of the patriarch under a much better theological light. In the decree itself it is still treated much too much from a mere juridical viewpoint.

All those conciliar wrangles prove once more how difficult it is for those Eastern Churches to be fully recognized. It explains also why several among them suffer from an inferiority complex towards the rest of the Catholic Church, still moulded in Western thought and practice. Inferior also they feel in one way or another towards the Orthodox of the same background, e. g. Byzantine. This is all the more true because the Orthodox remain in most cases the majority.

Such a sentiment of inferiority is often expressed by typical attitudes and reactions.

Sometimes it goes to the extent of denying the community of origin with the Orthodox counterpart. At least they look at the Orthodox with the attitude of superiority held by the Latin majority. Among others there is a tendency to assert their perpetual belonging to the Catholic Church in order to prevent or to

refute accusations from the Latin side of having been "schismatic", if not "heretic."

Often in certain circles of some Oriental Churches a conviction developed according to which Eastern christianity is all stagnant, even backward, whereas western christianity is all progress, enlightenment. Even inculturation, which is a view coming from the western intelligent is often used as a pretext against the most genuine oriental realities. Inculturation becomes a cover for Institution. Eastern theology and spirituality are therefore rejected, either as too conservative, or as too far removed from inculturation, some even consider them as redolent of a wrong view of life.

Practical consequences ensued. They form the core of the process of latinisation. Seminaries are organized along western models, including the teaching system. What is more, impelled by a desire of false universalism, candidates to the priesthood are sent to Latin seminaries, where nothing or next to nothing is done to train them in their own Oriental tradition. After six or seven years of such a lack of oriental formation, they come back latinized more than the Latins themselves. In most cases authentic oriental Monasticism is replaced by poor onces of western models of the "active" type.

In those gearwheels of latinisation the effects are many and diverse. The Holy Spirit is replaced by St Joseph, the Trinity is substituted by some form or other of a pietistic cult, Isaac of Niniveh is supplanted by the Imitation of Christ, Bar-Hebraeus is left out and instead we get Hans kung or the like. John Damascene is forgotten and Thomas Aquinas exalted. Many more examples can be given of such pietistic "substitutions".

Many age-long traditions, above all liturgical, are the target of the

latinisers. Leavened bread is given up, or substituted by wafers supposed to be fermented; even the original form of the altar-bread is replaced by Latin hosts. In some churches gone also is the fullness of the sacraments of initiation; chrismation is given later in life, and with the same explanation, as I heard it recently myself, as in modern western catechetics. Gone also is the Eastern view of marriage as the sacrament performed by the celebrant.

Marriage of the clergy was the first victim of the so-called Catholic model, permanent diaconate was also given up.

'Low Mass', kneeling, statues, an exaggerated cult of the Eucharist, novenas, and what have you, fill the bazaar borrowed from some parts of the Latin world, particularly the west Mediterranean. Oriental fine arts creations are discarded and the worst productions of the debased 'pious' art from the west are used without any discernment. It appears also that till recently the clergy of many an Oriental church was keen on assuming the trappings of western dignities and titles. Even some Orthodox did not entirely escape the temptation of purple garments...

Thus a stage is reached when characteristically enough an Eastern Catholic Church has become but a "rite", a mere garment, a juridical entity only. Actually it is mere rite that the Latin west regards the Oriental Catholics. When these especially their clergy, go abroad they do not loose time to obtain the faculty of celebrating in the Latin rite. They do it, often badly, but all the same they do it. It certainly does not make the Orthodox less critical of "uniatism", it is one of its main expressions. Often such temporary change of rite let us be blunt, is due to the desire of making money.

Such Eastern catholic churches, latinized as they are, easily provide vocations to dying or half-dying Latin congregations. The transfer is fairly easy, since the Oriental man or woman concerned is already despoiled of one's own identity. In the same way Latin institutions, often replacing much better Eastern ones, and religious of both sexes are welcome into such latinized Oriental dioceses on the condition that the "garment", i. e. the "rite" is practised. Since the spiritualities jar with each other, this type of orientalisation remains quite superficial. Briefly it is a big "joke". No love for the christian East exists among such "forced" Orientals, intended on getting the milk from the cow, not the cow itself, i.e. vocations, not the Church where from they come. What is more, they tend to destroy from within what their Latin predecessors did from with-out under the pretext of coming to help those "poor Orientals".

No gain is obtained for such latinized Orientals. All to the contrary, as Major Archbishop Josip Slipi said during the council, they surely sink still more in the Latin ocean (*ibid.*, v. III/V, p. 21)

III. The Ecumenical prospects of the Eastern Catholic Churches

Since Leo XIII's encyclical "Orientalium Dignitas" it was repeatedly affirmed that the Eastern Catholic Churches are or ought to be models that would facilitate the coming to union of the Orthodox. For some among the Orientals themselves their only "raison d'être" is just to bring in the Orthodox.

It may well be, as we see presently, that they are not models. At least they could be regarded as bridges. This is what the late great orthodox theologian, Alexander Schaemann wrote in his response to the conciliar decree

on the Eastern Catholic Churches: "The Eastern Catholic Communities (are) called now to serve as bridged to, rather than substitutes for, the Orthodox East" (M. M. Abbot Ed., *The Documents of Vatican II*, London-Doublin 1966, p. 387).

I myself wonder whether the word "substitutes" is correct. I do not find that the Eastern Catholic Churches were ever considered as standing for the Orthodox in the catholic church as it exists. Actually the shifting of emphasis is rather from a model to a bridge.

Be as it may, the Oriental Catholics, particularly those who are members of the Byzantine world, except those of S. Italy-Sicily, are for the Orthodox in a false position. Orthodox circles resent the very existence of such Eastern Catholic communities to which they most of the time refuse to give the name of Churches.

It cannot be denied, however, that as far as the catholic church, overwhelmingly Latin, is concerned, those Oriental catholics, at least some of them, helped towards a broadening of the western outlook and therefore towards a somehow better knowledge and understanding of the Christian East. This is also recognized by some of most discerning orthodox thinkers today.

At any rate the fact of being an Eastern Catholic makes christian life a difficult proposition. Why? Because it is not easy to reconcile two different experiences, the Oriental and the Catholic. This is all the more true because Eastern Christianity has a view of God, of man, of the Church, spiritual traditions, that appear at first sight close to the western approach, though it is experienced in a very different manner.

Truly the Eastern catholic churches help to introduce into the

catholic church the reality of ecclesial pluralism, and to keep it. They oblige the church to practise ecumenism at home before preaching it abroad, even when the Latin west or its equivalent is still reluctant to admit such a pluralism.

As far as the Orthodox are concerned, it is undeniable that in most cases the Eastern catholics united with Rome are not very helpful. Do they really, as some pretend, stand as examples of what the place of the Orthodox would be in the enlarged "catholica" of the future? But the very position of nearly all the Eastern Catholic Churches tells the Orthodox that they would not feel at home in the "Roman System" as it stands today. I dare say that many Eastern catholics are no bridge at all, they are rather obstacles to than ways towards universal unity.

I agree that orthodox views, often so negative towards an Oriental Catholicism, are no absolute standards, that they can be motivated by nonreligious factors, e. g. nationalism. The best among the Orthodox however, are not always wrong in their criticisms. Sometimes these provide us with the right criterion of value.

That are therefore the ecumenical prospects of the Eastern Catholic Churches today and tomorrow? Like other churches they have duties in a changed situation which their forefathers who joined the catholic church could not have foreseen.

They have to continue standing

as a living proof that there is in the Catholic Church a genuine and active presence of the Eastern tradition. They will not be able to do so, if they do not make a conscious and systematic, a revolutionary, return to the most authentic sources of their Oriental character. This includes assuming a real, often new, if not challenging, ecclesiology. They have to show that theological and ecclesiological differences are compatible with the broadest conception of the Catholic Church.

Much will have to be shed away, much will have to be forgotten. It is a matter of self-purification. To take one example: the Byzantines of South Italy and Sicily did it fifty years ago; they would not regret it today, I am sure.

Conclusion

This attempt at describing certain aspects of the Eastern Catholic Churches has no claim either to completeness, or to precision. In preparing it I must confess that I was influenced by the writings of Father Placid Podipara (May he rest in peace), and those of a few members of the Greek-Catholic patriarchate of Antioch.

By and large I have focussed on the problem of latinization. It may have been sometimes unavoidable, but now with better knowledge, independence and courage it is much easier to get rid of a latinizing past. It is to be replaced by Oriental genuineness. This calls for much vision, labour and time.

Presented in the INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE OF THE CATHOLIC ORIENTAL CHURCHES July 3-10, 1986 at PAURASTYA VIDYAPITHAM, KOTTAYAM.

The list of the Bishops of the Thomas Christians

(continuation)¹

Background²

The Portuguese colonialism in Malabar in its political realm lasted from 1498 to 1663. In 1663 the Dutch defeated them and established themselves here as the overlords upto 1795. The Dutch were then defeated by the English. Already in 1684 the English were permitted to have a trade settlement (Pandakassāla) at Anchuthengu by the queen Umayyamarāni. In 1723 the first trade agreement was made between Tiruvithāncōre and the English.

The second half of the 18th century was a period of great changes in the history of Kerala. In 1766 Haider Ali, a Muslim King from Mysore attacked Kōzhikode, the Northern kingdom of Kerala and advanced upto Cochin. He conquered also the fortress known as Tiruvithāncōre Kōtta. But in 1792 the English defeated Tippu Sultan, the son of Haider Ali. Haider and Tippu, it is said, converted 30,000 Christians in Karnātaka to Islam. He forced the Hindus and Christians to flee from Malabar and many took refuge in Tiruvithāncōre. He made a lot of forced conversion in Malabar to Islam. The Mysorean attack is known in History as "Tippu-vinte Padayōttam". After the defeat of Tippu Sultan, the Malabar coast came under the rule of the British.

In 1792 the Raja of Cochin made a treaty with the English and in 1795 the Raja of Travancore also made a similar agreement. Both the Rajas had to pay a large amount of money to keep the British soldiers in Malabar. In 1805 the treaty was renewed and the amount was doubled (8 lakhs rupees). A British Resident was appointed to help the administration of Tiruvithāncōre and Cochin; Kozhikode had already become part of the British Malabar Province.

By the end of the 18th century, antipathy towards the Christians was growing in Kerala. It was led by the then Diwān of Tiruvithāncōre called Vēlu Thampi and the Diwān of Cochin, Pāliathachen. There was a great Christian merchant, Thachil Māthu Tharakan, whom the English East India company and the Rajas owed much money. He was ill-treated and his property was confiscated. In this matter Colonel Manro, the British Resident sided with Vēlu. Finally Vēlu turned against Manro and tried to kill Manro treacherously. In the mutiny many a Christian on the seashore was killed.³ It was in 1808. It is known as "Vettikolappada". Already in 1795 the British prohibited the carrying of weapons by the Christians. That is why when the soldiers of Vēlu and Pāliath initiated the killing of the Christians, they could not defend

1. CO vol. VI/1-4 (1985); VIII/1 (1987).

2. M. O. Joseph, *Thachil Mathu Tharakan*, Kottayam, 1962.

3. It is said that he drowned 25000 Christians at Pallathuruthy (M. O. Joseph, *op. cit.* p. 371. 376.)

themselves. From Cochin to Quilon thousands of Christians were killed by Vēlu's soldiers, because they were having the same religion as that of Colonel Manro, the British Resident. It ended only with the defeat of the soldiers under Vēlu. Vēlu himself committed suicide in 1809. Thachil Māthu Tharakan was an influential Christian. He promoted the reunion of the two groups of the Thomas Christians, the Puthenkūttukār and the Pazhayakūttukār. He too encouraged Cariattil and Paremakkal and others to go to Rome to get the permission of Rome to receive Mar Dionysius I (+1808) to the Catholic fold. Mar Dionysius was the leader of the Puthenkūttukār. He was prepared to become a Catholic. After Mar Joseph Cariattil's death in Goa, Thachil Māthu continued the negotiations and on 22 June 1799 Mar Dionysius I, joined the Catholic Church at Thathampally (Alleppey). Because of the indifference and lack of cooperation from the part of the missionaries, Mar Dionysius I returned to the Jacobite Church after six months.

The Thiruvithāncōre Raja had to pay 14 lakhs of rupees to Thachil

Māthu Tharakan. And it was not returned to him nor to his successors. He was in charge of the sale of Salt, Tabacco, Wood and Pepper in Thiruvithāncōre under Rāmavarma Mahārāja. English East India company had to pay huge amount to him due to the wood business. In 1808 Colonel Manro invested for eight percent interest rupees 10500 (3000 Pūwarāhan) each in the English East India company both for the Puthenkūttukār (non-catholics) and the Pazhayakūttukār (catholics) of the Thomas Christians. This is known as *Vattippanam*. The amount for the Pazhayakūttukār is given in the name of the Vicar Apostolic of Verapoly and the amount for the Puthenkūttukār is in the name of the Metropolitan of the Jacobites. When there arose divisions in the Puthenkūttu community, each group claimed for the inheritance of this amount. The litigation is known as *Vattipanakkēss*.

Now we speak about the 'rulers' of the Thomas Christians during this period. The catholic Thomas Christians were divided between the padroado and propaganda jurisdictions.

The Propaganda Rulers (1779 – 1887)⁴

Carlo, Italian	1779–1783
Aloysius Mary, Italian	1784–1802
Raymundus, Italian	1803–1816
Peter Alcantara, Italian	1816–1821
Miles Prendergast, Irish	1821–1827
Maurelius Stabilini, Italian	1827–1831

4. Several of the Propaganda Rulers were only administrators. In the beginning their title was "Vicar Apostolic of Malabar". After 1845 the rulers came to be known as "the Vicar Apostolic of Verapoly". They were all Carmelites from Italy (ocd). This Vicariate Apostolic of Malabar was meant for those Thomas Christians (Catholic) who would not accept the rule of the Jesuits: "If the Carmelite missionaries had elected a Thomas Christian as coadjutor to Mar Alexander, if their behaviour in the case of Mar Simon (of 1701) had not created suspicion, if they had not conducted themselves arrogantly and as "autorevoli dominatori", if they had not been accused of having had bound, imprisoned and cruelly beaten Thomas Christian Priests, if they had not sent abroad prejudiced reports, if they had not obstinately clung to their mission which in the eyes of the

Francis Xavier of Anna, Italian ⁵	1831-1844
Ludovicus, Italian	1844-1853
Bernadine of St. Agnes, Italian	1853-1858
Bernadine Baccinelli, Italian ⁶	1859-1868
Chavara Kuriakose, Vicar General ⁷	1861-1871

Thomas Christians, they had manoeuvred to get like the Jesuits before them, if they had respected the legitimate claims of the Thomas Christians to have bishops of their own rite, if they had not harshly dealt with those who petitioned to Rome for the same, their regime would have been brighter, and the Thomas Christian community would have always been grateful to them in all things." (Placid J. Podipara, *The Thomas Christians*, London-Bombay, 1970, p. 196).

5. "Owing to troubles in Portugal Pope Gregory XVI suppressed the Padroado Sees of Cranganore and Cochin, and put all the faithful of these two Sees (both Thomas Christian and Latin) under the Vicariate Apostolic of Malabar which by now began to be known as "the Vicariate Apostolic of Verapoly". (*Ibid.* p. 186). So all the Catholic Thomas Christians came under the rule of the Vicar Apostolic of Verapoly. They requested Rome to confer on the Vicar Apostolic the title of Archbishop. It was granted to him in 1840 "instantibus Catholicis Syro-Malabaricis". His successors too were given this title, and finally when the Indian Latin Hierarchy under Propaganda was erected in 1886, Verapoly became a residential Archbishopric, not for the Syro-Malabarians, but for the Latins (*Ibid.*). At the suppression of the Padroado Sees of Cranganore and Cochin in 1836, the Vicariate Apostolic of Malabar was extended upto Canara. Later in 1845, it was divided into Verapoly, Quilon and Mangalore. Verapoly was limited between the rivers Pamba and Bharathapuzha. Most of the Thomas Christians came under Verapoly. (Placid J. Podipara, *The Hierarchy of the Syro-Malabar Church*, Alleppey, 1976, p. 161).
6. It was under him that some of the Syro Malabarians tried to get a Catholic Chaldean Bishop from West Asia. The leaders who collected the signatures were a certain Priest Antony Kudakkachira and another priest Antony Thondanatt. They succeeded in bringing Mar Rokos from the Catholic Patriarch Mar Audisho. The missionaries did not like it. So they appointed Chavara Kuriakose CMI as the Vicar General of Bernadine to dissuade the faithful from joining Mar Rokos. The Propaganda asked Bacinelli if his Vicar General for the Syro Malabarians could not be a bishop. The Carmelite missionaries answered negatively. According to the missionary Berardi, the Syro-Malabarians "were proud, unstable, prone to schism". "Although there were among them good priests by the goodness of their behaviour, still where is prudence?" asks the missionary. He continues, "Where is fortitude? Where is knowledge? and all the other qualities necessary for a bishop? I do not find these... Regarding Chavara Kuriakose the missionary Beccaro writes, "The only priest who has less impediments would be the Prior General..." (P. J. Podipara, *The Hierarchy*, p. 163-4).
7. Propaganda Congregation consulted Bernadine as to the opportuneness of consecrating Chavara as bishop of the Thomas Christians. But the missionaries were strongly against it. They depicted Chavara as an old man, a simpleton, who had no sufficient knowledge (Cfr, Placid J. Podipara, *The Thomas Christians* p. 189).

Mar Rokos, Chaldean Catholic ⁸	1861-1862
Mar Abdiso Thondanatt ⁹	1900
Leonard Mellano, Italian ¹⁰	1868-1887
Mar Mellus, Chaldean Catholic ¹¹	1876-1882
Mar Jacob ¹²	
Marcelline Berardi, Italian ¹³	1877-

The Padroado Rulers (1774-1887)

Salvador dos Reis	1773-1777
Scherpenzeel ¹⁴	
Soledade ¹⁴	1779-
Mar Joseph Cariattil ¹⁵	1782-1786
Paremmakkal Thoma Kathanār ¹⁶	1786-1799
Pandari Paulose ¹⁷	

-
8. Several of the parishes of the Thomas Christians, both of the Padroado and Propaganda jurisdictions joined him. But he had to leave Malabar. Fr. Chavara took a leading part in expelling him.
 9. He was a native Syro Malabar priest. He went to West Asia and became a bishop of the Nestorian Church. When he came back he repented and lived as a simple priest. But when Mar Mellus came he joined the faction. (P. J. Podipara, *The Hierarchy*, p. 162-3).
 10. He expelled seven C. M. I. Fathers from the Congregation because they "dared" to write to the Holy Father. Their leader was Aloysius Pazheparambil, whom the Holy See later made the bishop of Ernakulam (Cfr. Placid J. Podipara, *The Thomas Christians*, p. 193). Under Leonard, there came a Chaldean Bishop, Mellus by name. Several parishes of the Propaganda and Padroado groups joined him.
 11. Thirty Padroado and two Propaganda parishes and two latin parishes (partly) accepted him as their bishop. Fr. Kuriakose Pōrūrkarā C. M. I. took a leading role in expelling him from Malabar.
 12. Another Chaldean Priest who accompanied Mar Mellus to Malabar.
 13. He was appointed co-adjutor to Leonard in 1877, exclusively for the Thomas Christians. The coadjutor was asked by Rome to take councillors and a Vicar General from among the Thomas Christian priests, but he never nominated the councillors nor even a Vicar General.
 14. Administrator
 15. Dr. Cariattil had his studies in Rome. He was deputed by the Thomas Christians to present the petitions in Rome. The Propaganda was not favourable towards him. Finally, in 1782 he was nominated Archbishop of the Padroado See of Cranganore. He had to change his rite and adopt the Latin rite to receive the Episcopal ordination. After long delay in Portugal, he started for Malabar. But he died in Goa, on 10th September 1786.
 16. After the death of Mar Joseph Cariattil, he was appointed as the administrator. He was not a bishop. He was the author of the book, "Varthamanapusthakam". All the Catholic Thomas Christians came under him.
 17. He was a Syro-Malabar priest. He went to West Asia and returned as a bishop. He was not received by the people. After the death of Thoma Kathanar, Pandari Paulose made a faction in the church (Placid, *op. cit.*

Kattakayam Abraham	
Ribamar	1799-1800
George Sankurikal ¹⁸	1800-1801
Dominicus	1810-
Joachim Bohlo	
Thomas Aquinas ¹⁹	-1823
Paiseito Doforto ²⁰	1826-1838
Antony Paul Pinto ²¹	1864-1866
Joseph Ayres de Silveira	1866
Antony Correa	1867-1869
Antony Vincent	1870
Valentine Constantine	1875
Francis Borbosa	1876
Benedict Gomes	
Casmir Nazareth	1877-1884
Narcise	1885-
Cajetan	1885-1887

Indian Latin Hierarchy (1886)

In 1886 the Latin Hierarchy under the Propaganda was erected in India. The Vicariate Apostolic of Verapoly became a metropolitan archdiocese of the Latin Church, with Leonard Mellano ocd as its first residential archbishop-metropolitan and Quilon as its suffragan See. The Padroado Archdiocese was suppressed (It was originally the Metropolitan See of Angamaly of the Thomas Christians. It was transferred to Cranganore. Later it became a Padroado See). The title of Cranganore was given *ad honorem* to the Portuguese Padroado bishop of Damuan. The Portuguese Padroado archbishop of Goa became "Patriarch of the East Indies". So

the title of Angamaly went over to the Padroado See Damuan. When Damuan was suppressed, the title "Archbishop of Cranganore" was given to the Portuguese archbishop of Goa.

In 1886 the Thomas Christians (catholic) who lived between the rivers Pampa and Bhārathapuzha came under the newly erected archdiocese of Verapoly. In 1887 they were ritually separated from the Latins. The *Vicariates Apostolic of Trichur and Kottayam* were constituted for them. *Adolf Medlycott* and *Charles Lavigne*, two non Carmelite Latins became the vicars apostolic, respectively. In 1896 the two Vicariates were reorganized into three and the Vicars Apostolic were all Thomas Christians:

p. 169. 177). Fr. Kattakayam was elected as the Administrator. But Goa nominated another man, a European.

18. He was a Syro Malabar Priest. He was only an administrator then followed three more administrators. Fr. Sankurikal was appointed to work against Pandari Paulose and Kattakayam.
19. He was first administrator. In 1821 he was made Archbishop (1821-3). After that upto 1838 all administrators.
20. See no. 5 above.
21. The Padroado See Cranganore was restored. The Thomas Christians were free to accept either the Propaganda Vicariate Apostolic of Verapoly or the Padroado Portuguese jurisdiction of Cranganore. All the leaders of Cranganore were only administrators.

Book Reviews

Georg Galitis – Georg Mantzaridis – Paul Wiertz: Glauben aus dem Herzen. Eine Einführung in die Orthodoxie. Mit einem Nachwort von Werner O. Fleisst. München: TR-Verlagsunion, 1987, 260 pp., Ppb. DM 28,00.

Mr. Fleisst is the author of a television series "To believe out of the heart" in which the Eastern Orthodox Church (Byzantine rite) is presented to the western world. Two Greek Orthodox and one R.C. authors wrote a handbook for those interested in the contents of the TV series. This book is very instructive and recommendable. But we have to refuse what Mr. Galitis, professor of NT theology at Athens University and President of the Greek Society for Biblical Studies, who is a member of the Orthodox-Catholic theological dialogue commission, is writing on "Uniatism" and the Oriental Catholic Churches. His assertions (p. 35f.) are unjust, offensive and partly even wrong. This is unfortunately a stain in this excellent book which really can give enlightenment. It is divided into six chapters: The world of Orthodoxy – The Orthodox Church – Orthodox Faith – Orthodox worship – Means and Ways to Salvation – The Orthodox Church in Today's World.

J. Madey

St John Chrysostom: On Marriage and Family Life. Translated by Catherine P. Roth and David Anderson. Introduction by Catherine P. Roth. Crestwood, NY 10707: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986, 114 pp., Ppb. \$ 4.95.

This small booklet can really become a treasury-house for the reader. After a brief, but very good introduction, Catherine P. Roth has selected the Saint's teaching on marriage from his homilies 20,21,19 and 12 as well as from two sermons. Most of St John Chrysostom's instructions have a timeless relevance for Christian family life: he stresses equal responsibility of husband and wife, integrity of their marriage, care of the parents with the children's upbringing by providing them with good examples to counter the bad examples offered by popular entertainments. – Take, read and listen to this Father of the Church!

J. Madey

Trichur-John Menacherry
Ernakulam-Aloysius Pazheparampil
Changanacherry-Mathew Makil

In 1911 the Vicariate of Kottayam for the Southists was erected and Mathew Makil became its first Vicar Apostolic. In Changanacherry Thomas Kurialacherry became the Vicar Apostolic. In 1917 the Thomas Christians came under the Congregation for the

Oriental Churches. In 1923 the Syro-Malabar Hierarchy was reestablished. It was suppressed for 324 years (1599-1923). During these years the Portuguese colonial powers tried every means to merge this oriental apostolic church into the Latin church. They had the political power, and every influence in Rome. But the Thomas Christians strongly resisted till the end.

(to be continued)

G. Chediath.

The Fathers Speak: St Basil the Great, St Gregory of Nazianzus, St Gregory of Nyssa. Selected letters and life records translated from the Greek and introduced by Georges A. Barrois. With a Foreword by John Meyendorff. Crestwood, Ny 10707: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986, 225 pp., Ppb. \$ 8.95

The publisher is to be congratulated for having offered the reader this selection from the writings of these three important Fathers of the Church who are simply called "The Three Hierarchs". Especially monks (religious), priests and bishops will find here a mine of instruction. This anthology is divided in 11 chapters: 1 – The Solitude in Pontus, 2 – Biographical, 3 – The Quest for Wisdom, 4 – Monastic Ideal, 5 – Priests and Hierarchs: Their Calling, 6 – Priests and Hierarchs: Shepherds of the Sheep, 7 – Priests and Hierarchs: Upholders of Orthodoxy, 8 – Priests and Hierarchs: The Arian Persecution, 9 – Hierarchs' Frustrations, 10 – Glimpses of Daily Life, 11 – Ailments and Deaths. Worth reading are also the foreword, the introduction and the epilogue. We warmly recommend this book for meditation.

J. Madey

Klaus Gamber – Wilhelm Nyssen: Verweilen im Licht: Kult und Bild der Kirche Armeniens. Köln: Luthé-Verlag, 1986 (= Schriftenreihe des Zentrums patristischer Spiritualität im Erzbistum (Köln, XX), 182 pp. + 32 illustrations, DM 58,00

This book is really a very useful publication, as it gives the reader the opportunity to enter into the essentials of the worship and faith of a widely unknown church. Today this church is living in the diaspora. Armenia was the first State in history which made the Christian religion the official religion in its boundaries. But a tragic history made Armenia the prey of its neighbours. The first part of the book is devoted to the liturgy of the Armenian Church. Msgr. Gamber, director of the Institute of Liturgiology in Regensburg, introduces the reader into the church building and the structure of the Armenian liturgy. Thereafter the text of the liturgy is given in a good German translation. In the second part, Msgr. Nyssen, director of the patristic centre of the archdiocese of Cologne and university chaplain, offers an introduction into the Armenian iconography which is always accompanied by the pertinent hymn. The icons excellently reproduced in this book, were photographed from the manuscript collection of the Armenian Apostolic Patriarchate of Jerusalem.

J. Madey

Lore Bartholomäus: In jedem Kreuz ein Lebensbaum. Aus Armeniens Erbe und Gegenwart. Illustrationen von Mehti Horz-Benson. Köln: Luthé-Verlag, 1986, 286 pp., DM 24,50

This is not a theological work, but we may learn a lot about the Armenian people, their history, literature, religion, geography, their present life in exile. The author has contacted many people in order to realize this work. She takes us into the ancient times of Armenian history and makes us know the religion in pre-Christian Armenia. Then we reach the first christian State in the world with Gregory the Illuminator, Armenia's "Apostle", who raised his people giving them script and thus literature. The third chapter describes the fate of the Armenian Church which has become a "Church of the Martyrs". The fourth and last chapter deals with the diaspora situation of this people. A popular, but instructive book which should find many readers.

J. Madey

News

1. Syro-Malankara Church in U.S.

There are three Malankara priests working full time in three missions – New York, Philadelphia and Washington D.C. Two priests studying in Chicago and Toronto look after the mission part-time. The malankara communities in Houston, Dallas, Florida, etc have been organised and they eagerly desire to worship God in the traditional way in which they were born and brought up. The priests do everything to make available the liturgy for the people wherever they are. The missions are growing spiritually and materially.

2. Appointments

– The Holy Father has accepted the resignation of His Excellency Most Rev. Augustine Hornyak from the office of Apostolic Exarch for the Ukrainian faithful in Great Britain and has appointed in his place His Excellency Most Rev. Michael Hrynchyshyn C.Ss.R., as the Ap. Administrator.

– The Holy Father has given his consent to the canonical election, by the catholic Armenian Synod, of Father Vartan Achkarian of the Mechitarist Congregation of Vienna as Auxiliary of Cilicia of the Armenians.

3. Cardinal Lubachivsky will visit Poland

Poland is celebrating in 1988 the millennium of Christianity among the Eastern Slavs. Cardinal Lubachivsky the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church has been invited by the polish primate Cardinal Glemp to visit the polish Marian shrine at Czestochowa. The Cardinal has plan to visit also Israel and Yugoslavia.

4. Byzantine Rite Celebration in Hungary

The diocese of Hajdudorog in Hungary celebrated the 75th Anniversary of its establishment. The closing ceremonies were held at the famous shrine of the weeping Madonna of Mariapocs. The Sacred Liturgy presided over by Card. D.S. Lourdasamy, Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental churches, was attended by over a lakh of the faithful. The entire Hungarian Episcopate was present at the celebration.

5. The Holy Father presides at restored Armenian liturgy

On 21 November 1987, the Holy Father John Paul II presided at a Divine Liturgy in the Armenian rite in the Basilica of St Mary in Trastevere, Rome. His Beatitude Hovhannes Bedros XVIII Kasparian, the Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenians celebrated the Liturgy. During the homily, the Holy Father referred to the courageous restoration of the Armenian liturgy to its original purity and summoned all the Oriental churches to be faithful to their genuine traditions and preserve them. The Holy Father mentioned the significance of the day. It was for the first time that the Armenian church used a

liturgical text based on the traditions common to all the Armenians, catholic and orthodox. This was a sign of profound sharing in the one faith and in the manner of its expression. About the concern of the Holy See on matters of traditions Holy Father emphatically stated:

"I would like it to be the symbol of the Apostolic See's *determination* - which the council so effectively underscored-in asking of the Eastern churches in full communion with her the *courage to rediscover the authentic traditions of their own identity, restoring, where necessary, their original purity, if external changes have altered it in the course of the centuries*" (Cf. OE. 6).

The Armenian community had to undergo sufferings and martyrdom to preserve their identity as a people and as believers. The rich heritage of their faith is a contribution to the universal church. The Holy Father congratulated them for all their perseverance and courage.

"The liturgy is the place in which this faith becomes proclamation and adoration", said the Holy Father. This shows the importance of Liturgy in the life of faith. Liturgy is not any kind of celebration, it is the celebration of faith.

Finally, the Holy Father requested all the Easterners to be models of *authenticity and fidelity* to one's own identity.

"...strive ever increasingly to become models of *authenticity, respecting and fully appreciating their own identities*, giving absolute primacy to the *rediscovery of these identities* where they have been weakened or obscured with time. This will be a most effective manner of preparing the way that leads to the union of all christians in one profession of faith and in the communion of one cup".

Restoration is seen as a means to promote ecumenism. In the Indian context, the Catholic Oriental Churches should courageously and wholeheartedly follow the guidance of the Apostolic See. The Syro-Malabar church began its step on Feb. 8, 1986, when their restored liturgy was formally inaugurated by the Holy Father himself at Kottayam where Fr. Chavara and Sr. Alphonsa were beatified. The events that occurred afterwards are however not encouraging (Refer *Christian Orient*, vol. VIII, 3, 1987, p. 148f, No. 1, p. 3ff). The Holy Father, intervened personally giving concrete instructions to the Bishops of India. Among other things, the Holy Father asked them to consider all the three churches with equal rights and obligations and to establish dioceses for the orientals living in the so-called 'latin territories' etc. Unfortunately, the attitude of the Latin Church in India is not encouraging. In this context the words of the Holy Father during the homily in Rome indicate the determination of the Holy See. The Holy Father concludes:

"Your openness to Catholic communion does not limit, but rather strengthens your identity as Armenians and summons you to express it in all its articulate richness, for the benefit of all". Fidelity to one's own tradition is not narrow mindedness; it enriches the church of Christ.

6. Joint Declaration of Pope John Paul II and Patriarch Dimitrios I

His Holiness Pope John Paul II and His Holiness the Ecumenical Patriarch Dimitrios I signed a joint declaration on 7 December, 1987 at the conclusion of the Ecumenical Patriarch's visit to the Holy Father and to the

church of Rome. In the declaration the desire is expressed that "advances of the dialogue may bring Catholics and Orthodox to grow in better mutual understanding and in greater charity". Preaching, catechesis and theological formation are mentioned as means for fruitful dialogue.

7. The Holy Father visits Pontifical Oriental Institute of Rome

On December 8, 1987 His Holiness John Paul II paid a short visit to the Pontifical Oriental Institute of Rome. In his address His Holiness mentioned the initial purpose of the Institute as a necessary study instrument and as the centre for the spread of the theology, the spirituality and the life of the Christian East for the whole Catholic Church. Holy Father highlighted in his speech the richness of the Eastern heritage. The great theological heritage can be the source of rich points of reflection and stimulating perspectives for every theological tract. Knowledge of the Eastern churches and their doctrine thus constitutes a singularly vast field, one which is open to constant and systematic study and which can be of service to all Christian communities. Holy Father said that since Easterners migrate in large number to the West, the knowledge of the East should be inserted into the *curriculum* of the theological studies of pastors.

8. New Private Secretary to the Pope

Msgr. Vincent Tran Ngoc Thu, 69, a North Vietnamese priest has been appointed one of Pope John Paul II's private secretaries.

9. Postal stamp in honour of Blessed Kuriakose Chavara

Indian postal department has issued a postage stamp honouring Fr. Kuriakose Elias Chavara. Fr. Chavara was a founder of the C.M.I. Congregation of the Syro-Malabar Church and was beatified on Feb. 8, 1986 at Kottayam by Pope John Paul II.

10. Symposium in honour of Cardinal Parecattil

St Thomas Academy for Research organised a symposium from 28 to 30 Nov. 1987 at Ernakulam to honour the late Cardinal Joseph Parecattil of the Archdiocese of Ernakulam. He was the first to be made a Cardinal from the Syro-Malabar Church. The papers of the symposium analysed the life, activities, ideologies etc of the late Cardinal.

11. Benedictine Monastery in Syro-Malabar Church

On 20 January 1988 a new religious house of the Benedictine Tradition was formally inaugurated in Kerala. The identity of this new house consists in its endeavour to give it an oriental direction according to the Syro-Malabar Tradition. The house is situated at Kappad in the diocese of Kanjirapally near Kottayam.

FORM OF DECLARATION

- 1) Place of Publication 580/XIV, Manganam, Kottayam-18.
- 2) Periodicity of Publication Quarterly
- 3) Printer's name, Nationality Dr. Thomas Mannooramparampil
and address Indian, 288/XIII, P. B. I, Kottayam 686010
- 4) Publisher's name, nationality Dr. Thomas Mannooramparampil; Indian,
and address 288/XIII, P. B. I, Kottayam 686010
- 5) Editor's name, nationality Dr. Thomas Mannooramparampil; Indian,
and address 288/XIII, P. B. I, Kottayam 686010
- 6) Owner's name Christian Orient Trust, 580/XIV
Manganam, Kottayam 686010
- 7) I hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Sd/-

20 - 2 - '88.

Dr. Thomas Mannooramparampil
Publisher

Pontifical Oriental Institute of Religious Studies Publications

- Thomas Mannooramparampil, **The Anaphora and the Post Anaphora of the Syro-Malabar Qurbana**, pp. xiii + 161, Rs. 35.00
- John Moolan, **The Period of Annunciation-Nativity in the East Syrian Calendar**, 1985, pp. xxxiii + 298, Rs. 50.00
- Thomas Moolayil, **The Catholic Youth Movements and The Emerging Youth of Kerala**, 1985, pp. 245. Rs. 60.00
- Mar Abraham Mattam, **The Indian Church of the St. Thomas Christians and Her Missionary Enterprises Before the 16th Century**, 1985, pp. 66, Rs. 6.00
- Placid J. Podipara CMI, **The Canonical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church**, 1986, pp. 148, Rs. 35.00
- J. Madey, **Ecumenism, Ecumenical Movement and Eastern Churches**, 1986, pp. 312, Rs. 40.00
- Andrews Thazhath, **The Juridical Sources of the Syro-Malabar Church**, 1986, pp. 400, Rs. 60.00
- Alex Paul Urumpackal, **Vocation in India**, Vol. 1, The Religious Women, 1986, pp. xxii + 340, Rs. 120.00
- J. Kottackal, **An Introduction to Bible**, 1986, pp. 204, Rs. 18.00

For Copies Please Contact

The Manager
Pont. Orient. Inst. Publications
P. B. No. 1, Kottayam - 686 010
Kerala, India